

JPRS-TAC-85-052

16 November 1985

**Worldwide Report**

**ARMS CONTROL**

**FBIS**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

16 November 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

## CONTENTS

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow Continues Attacks on U.S. Interpretation of ABM Treaty (Moscow TASS, 14 Oct 85; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 27, 31 Oct 85) .....	1
U.S. 'Wants Summit to Fail' .....	1
'Pretext of Soviet Superiority', by Ye. Nikitin .....	1
'Storm of Indignation' in NATO, V. Chernyshev .....	5
GDR Reportedly Involved in Space Defense System (Hamburg DPA, 25 Oct 85) .....	10
FRG's Rau Discusses SDI (Mainz ZDF Television Network, 23 Oct 85) .....	11
TASS Criticizes FRG Defense Minister's NEWSWEEK Remarks (Moscow TASS, 1 Oct 85) .....	12
Criticism of SDI by London Forum Participants Noted (A. Maslennikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 1 Nov 85) .....	14
Briefs	
USSR Notes House Vote .....	17

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG Papers Comment on Reagan's UN Address (Various sources, various dates) .....	18
Viewed as Preview to Geneva, by Hans Ulrich Kempfski .....	18
Seeking Change in Relations, by Fritz Wirth .....	19
Need for Clear Concept Noted, by Pierre Simonitsch .....	20
FRG's Kohl Meets Reagan, Shevardnadze in New York (Hamburg DPA, 25, 27 Oct 85) .....	22
Comments on Reagan Meeting .....	22
Report on Shevardnadze Meeting .....	22
Discusses Upcoming Summit .....	23

Soviet Comments on Mid-October Meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers (Various sources, various dates) .....	24
U.S. 'Did Not Want Conference', by Viktor Levin	24
Meeting Opens, by Aleksandr Zholkver	25
NATO Supports Talks With USSR	25
NATO, U.S. Views Contrasted	26
Shultz 'Looked Embarrassed', by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy	26
PRAVDA Commentary, by V. Drobkov	27
FRG's Kohl Discusses New York Talks, Geneva Summit (Helmut Kohl Interview; Bonn DIE WELT, 28 Oct 85) .....	29
Gorbachev Letter to FRG Explains USSR's Summit Stance (Hamburg DPA, 30 Oct 85) .....	32
FRG's HANDELSBLATT on Approach to Geneva Summit (Editorial, Viola Herms Drath; Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT, 28 Oct 85) .....	33
FRG's Genscher Outlines Expectations From Summit Talks (Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 25 Oct 85) .....	35
FRG Newspaper on Kohl's Optimism About East-West Ties (Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, 28 Oct 85) .....	36
Briefs	
USSR 'Peace' Official's Australia Remarks	37
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Soviet Comment on Netherlands Parliamentary Debate on Cruise Missiles (Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Oct 85; Moscow TASS, 2, 11 Oct 85) ...	38
'Limit Netherlands Sovereignty', by V. Drobkov	38
TASS Comment	39
Petition Signed by Dutch Citizens	39
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
TASS Commentary on 'Faked' U.S. Report on Soviet CW Potential (Moscow TASS, 29 Oct 85) .....	40
USSR: U.S. CW Plans Threaten European Theater (Nikolay Borin; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 29 Oct 85) .....	41
TASS Report on U.S. House Committee Chemical Arms Funding Vote (Moscow TASS International Service, 25 Oct 85) .....	42



## GENERAL

Moscow Assails U.S. Plans for Neutron Weapons (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 16 Oct 85; Moscow TASS International Service, 17 Oct 85) .....	43
Military Newspaper Report, by Yu. Borin	43
TASS Comment, by Oleg Shirokov	44
USSR: Socialist October 1985 Disarmament Conference in Vienna (Moscow TASS, 16 Oct 85; Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Oct 85) .....	46
TASS Report	46
PRAVDA Comment, by Ye. Grigoryev, Yu. Zhukov	47
Moscow Notes UN General Assembly Debates on Disarmament (Moscow TASS, various dates) .....	52
TASS Cites Mexican, Soviet Representatives	52
Austria, Colombia, Indonesia, Kuwait Cited	52
Outer Space Cooperation Proposed	53
Debate Ends	54
USSR's Space Guidelines-Official UN Document	55
Soviet Comment on Disarmament Message From Non-Aligned Leaders (Moscow PRAVDA, 30 Oct 85; Moscow TASS, 30 Oct 85) .....	56
Leaders' Message	56
Sweden's Palme Briefs Press	58
U.S. Rejects Appeal	58
Nakasone Meets Reagan, Supports Arms Control Initiatives (Shiro Yoneyama; Tokyo KYODO, 25 Oct 85) .....	60

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW CONTINUES ATTACKS ON U.S. INTERPRETATION OF ABM TREATY

U.S. 'Wants Summit to Fail'

LD150913 Moscow TASS in English 2208 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Text] New York 14 October TASS--THE NEW YORK TIMES today carries an article on the manoeuvres of the U.S. Administration over the ABM Treaty. It says, inter alia:

For 13 years the treaty has been universally understood to mean what it says: That any ABM system based in space is outlawed. Now the claim is that it means the opposite. This amazing proposition was (?first) publicly advanced on television last week by President Reagan's national security advisor, Robert McFarlane. He said the 1972 treaty "approved and authorized" development and testing of space-based ABM systems.

THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses that treaties are meant to be serious undertakings. This one was negotiated for a purpose that all the understood, to limit defensive systems [sentence as received]. The United States Senate consented to the treaty by a vote of 88 to 2. Thirteen years later America would be telling the world: "The terms are inconvenient to us now, so on second thought they decided that (?they) mean nothing. The Soviet-U.S. summit, the article continues, is to focus on arms control, and what would be left to say if the United States had just in effect renounced the main existing arms agreement? With the restraints on defensive system gone, the Soviet Union would hardly proceed with its recent proposal to cut back on offensive weapons.

Why would anyone in the Reagan administration be pushing to read the ABM Treaty out of existence? The answer is that the man who surely started this game of words wants the summit to fail and wants all arms control to end.

'Pretext of Soviet Superiority'

PM301016 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[Commentary by Captain Second Rank Ye. Nikitin, under "Military Political Review" rubric: "The Threat of War Has Not Receded"]

[Text] Stefan Zweig's historical vignettes contain lines about the "starry hours of mankind." The great writer discusses turning points of history "when a single 'yes' or 'no' settles everything and predetermines everything. Being premature or late preordains the destiny of hundreds of generations and directs the lives of individuals, an entire people, or even all of mankind."

These words by the great Austrian writer spring to mind now. You automatically associate them with the state of affairs in the modern world and the historically important stage through which the world is passing.

Mankind has in fact reached a very crucial point. The fate not only of the present generation, but of subsequent ones too depends on the direction mankind takes from this point on--whether toward strengthening security or toward the edge of the abyss.

The principle danger looming over our planet is the unceasing arms race unleashed by U.S. imperialism. There exists a real threat that this race may be transferred into outer space. The situation is aggravated by the fact that existing nuclear weapons are being modernized and becoming increasingly powerful and destructive. Non-nuclear means are coming close to nuclear means in terms of their destructive capability. Combat systems based on totally new principles are being developed [razrabatyvatsya]. But this is just one aspect of the matter.

The other aspect is the fact that it is already becoming difficult to begin talks to halt the destructive process of the arms race. But, what will the future hold if the militarization of outer space begins; if space strike arms are created [sozdavatsya]?

It is clear to every sensible person that events could get out of control in the future. That is not at all an exaggeration, but the objective reality. As M.S. Gorbachev observed during his French television appearance: "...we have in reality reached a very crucial stage in the development of the international situation."

But a crucial historical stage, after all, requires the adoption of responsible measures. From this standpoint the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries, as the Warsaw Pact statement "For the Elimination of the Nuclear Threat and a Turn for the Better in European and World Affairs," pointed out, see the key task of our time as halting the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and making the transition to disarmament.

The implementation by the Soviet Union and United States of a number of immediate measures would make a major practical contribution to resolving this task. This involves, above all, suspending all work on creating [sozdaniye], testing, and deploying space strike arms, including anti-satellite arms; freezing already existing nuclear armaments at their present quantitative level with maximum limitation of their modernization and simultaneous halting of the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of new kinds and types of these armaments; and stopping the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe.

The Soviet Union maintains a consistent, constructive, and peace-loving line in all these very important areas. This is borne out by the universally known facts, which speak for themselves.

Above all, we are not carrying out work to create [sozdaniye] space strike weapons and are not developing [razrabatyvat] ABM systems for the country. The unfounded charges against the Soviet Union that it is also carrying out the development [razrabotka] of space strike arms are nothing other than malicious lies by the opponents of detente. It is true that our country is carrying out fundamental research work in the sphere of outer space and work to create [sozdaniye] and improve space early warning systems and space systems for prospecting, communications, navigation, and meteorology. But, we do not have a "Star Wars" program; the USSR punctiliously fulfills the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems. A moratorium on the launching of anti-satellite weapons into space has been in force in the Soviet Union since 1983.

Or take the USSR's attitude to another important problem--freezing existing nuclear arms. The relevance of the problem is shown by the following fact alone. Specialists estimate that there is the equivalent of four metric tons of trinitrotoluene, that is to say, conventional explosive, for every man, woman, and child living on our planet. Common sense tells us we must immediately freeze the nuclear arsenals both quantitatively and qualitatively. It would then be possible to start a process of real disarmament.

Specific initiatives on this score were advanced by the Soviet Union back in June 1983 in a Soviet Government appeal to all nuclear states. To break the problem free from deadlock the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August this year through 1 January 1986. It was stated the moratorium will remain in force beyond then if the United States follows our example.

And, finally, there are the new Soviet proposals. They are well-known to everyone. "We propose," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said in a speech during his visit to Bulgaria, "very simple and clear things: Cutting the respective nuclear armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States by half; shutting fast the door leading to the siting of weapons in outer space; and halting and reversing the buildup of nuclear missiles in Europe."

These new proposals, in combination with earlier ones, comprise a Soviet program of realistic and far-reaching measures whose implementation could lead to the normalization of the complex and dangerous international situation. It is universally recognized that the Soviet Union's new peace-loving initiatives can get the world out of the arms race impasse and eliminate obstacles at the Geneva talks. The Soviet Union is seeking one thing here--just and honest agreements based on the principles of equality and identical security. It is not seeking any military advantages for itself at all.

How, then does the U.S. side respond to the Soviet Union's open, clear, and irreproachably logical proposals? After some confusion, Washington began falsifying and publicly discrediting our initiatives, endeavoring to



misinterpret them, present them in a false light, and belittle their significance. Virtually all senior U.S. Administration spokesmen have actively opposed the Soviet proposals in recent days. The myth of "Soviet military superiority" is being whipped up. The White House has obviously forgotten about or is pretending it is unaware of the relevant conclusions drawn by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who stressed in a report to Congress only this year that there exists "rough nuclear parity" between the two countries at the present time. Yet, it is precisely on the pretext of "Soviet military superiority" that Washington is carrying out its extensive "strategic modernization" program, including the building and deployment of the latest nuclear systems such as the MX and Midgetman missiles, two types of heavy bombers, the Trident missiles-carrying submarine systems, and Pershing-2 and cruise missiles.

Washington is casting caution to the wind in its efforts to "prove" the USSR is carrying out its own "Strategic Defense Initiative." They have even gone so far as to claim the "Russians possess the world's only operational anti-satellite weapon system." And that, as has already been noted, in a context where for two years the Soviet Union has had a moratorium on the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of anti-satellite systems. Acting in the spirit of Goebbels' propaganda, they are trying to blame the USSR for all they are doing themselves. They assert, for example, that the Soviet Union "has already gone far beyond scientific research" in developing [sozdaniye] a strategic defense. And, in order to thoroughly intimidate the average U.S. citizen, they are questioning the USSR's commitment to the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems.

Across the Atlantic they have, so to speak, invented a "new interpretation" of the ABM Treaty whereby it is apparently permitted to develop [razrabatyvat], test, and create [sozdavat] anti-satellite weapons based on different physical principles, that is to say, laser, beam, and other kinds of both land-based and space-based weapons. R. McFarlane, assistant to the President for national security affairs, for example, claims without batting an eyelid that the treaty "sanctions the testing of any ABM system provided they are based on other physical principles." How can such an interpretation be described as anything other than flagrant cheating?

After all, Article I of the ABM Treaty records in black and white that the sides undertook "not to deploy [razvertyvat] ABM systems for the defense of the territory of their country and not create a base for such a defense." And, according to Article V of the treaty they undertook "not to develop [sozdavat] test, or deploy [razvertyvat] ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." As we can see, the "Star Wars" program stands in flagrant contradiction to the ABM Treaty on two counts. First, because work is being carried out to create [sozdavat] an ABM system for the whole territory of the United States, which is banned under Article I of the treaty. And second, because a space-based ABM system is involved, which is banned under Article V.

In their attempts to obscure an extremely clear issue some people in Washington cite an agreed statement appended to the treaty--so-called Statement D, which, it is said, allows the creation [sozdaniye] of ABM means based on other physical principles (lasers, directed energy beams, and so forth). But the

whole point is that the possibility of the emergence of such means is allowed only with regard to the limited ABM defense areas permitted by the treaty and with regard to land-based stationary systems. Each side is permitted to have just one such area covered by an ABM system. No other interpretation of the text of Statement D is possible. The point of this disgraceful ballyhoo created by the U.S. Administration around the ABM Treaty was expressed by the Pentagon chief, who stated without any subterfuge: "We must examine the possibility of actually breaking the ABM Treaty."

No matter what they say across the Atlantic to mislead the public, Washington's practical deeds show that the United States is seeking to provide itself with the capability of a nuclear first strike against the USSR and to escape retaliation by creating [sozdat] an ABM system.

The threat of world nuclear war has not receded. In these conditions there must be no weakening or slackening of vigilance. History has placed special responsibility on the USSR and the other socialist countries, since there is no other such powerful force capable of restraining the aggressive forces of imperialism and preventing them from toppling the world into the abyss of nuclear war.

The "starry hour of mankind" has struck. There now exists, it can be said, a unique opportunity to achieve a mutually acceptable accord. It is up to the U.S. Administration. The peoples of the world expect that it will approach the matter responsibly.

#### 'Storm of Indignation' in NATO

PM311010 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS Military observer V. Chernyshev article under rubric "TASS: Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA." "Valid Concerns. Washington Is Continuing the Line of Undermining the ABM Treaty"]

[Text] When he came to Western Europe U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger ran up against sharp dissatisfaction on the part of the allies with Washington's attitude to the unlimited-duration Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty and with the U.S. line of undermining it. After all, it is precisely C. Weinberger's department that is the main initiator of the "new interpretations" of this exceptionally important document that, as Britain's the DAILY TELEGRAPH admits, have caused a storm of indignation in the NATO countries.

It will be recalled that on 6 October this year Washington loudly proclaimed a so-called "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty whereby the development [razrabotka] and testing of systems and components for the "Star Wars" program are not only not prohibited, but are virtually sanctioned by the treaty. What is more, even the fact that the deployment of arms under the program is prohibited was called into question. There is allegedly only one restriction--ABM systems and components must be based on "other principles than ABM interceptor missiles."



This "discovery" was made public by the President's national security assistant, R. McFarlane, but it was prepared in the Pentagon. Defense Department legal adviser F. Kinsberg, who has no experience whatever in the field of arms limitation and reduction, but is a "great expert" in the struggle against the Mafia and against pornography, having spent less than a week familiarizing himself with documents relating to the talks, submitted conclusions totally changing the juridical position of four U.S. Presidents. These conclusions greatly astonished even an experienced "hax" like Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle, who, according to a report in THE WASHINGTON POST, "almost fell off his chair." However, R. Perle was highly gratified: At last, all the obstacles to the unimpeded fulfillment of the "Star Wars" program could be jettisoned and there was no need to rack his brains about how to fulfill the instructions of the Pentagon boss, who had just declared: "We must consider the possibility of a real breach [razryv] of the ABM Treaty."

However, the world public by no means shared the delight of R. Perle and the opinions of R. McFarlane and C. Weinberger. Prominent U.S. politicians, public figures, and experts in the disarmament sphere called this "broad interpretation" downright cheating, an "absurdity," a "deliberate distortion," a "crude misinterpretation," and an "irresponsible step." Even P. Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms reduction talks, warned that the change in U.S. policy regarding the ABM Treaty "could now cause a real storm among U.S. allies and supporters of arms control in Congress."

Britain's THE TIMES expressed the opinion of Washington's West European allies themselves: A public departure from the strict bounds laid down by the treaty regarding the testing and deployment of new arms, especially space arms, would have catastrophic consequences. Such a step would cause angry protests in Western Europe, would split public opinion in the United States itself, and might lead to the collapse of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

Even Britain and the FRG, which are ardent supporters of the U.S. "Star Wars" program, voiced "serious objections," "concern," and "dissatisfaction" in connection with the review of the U.S. attitude to the ABM Treaty.

The U.S. Administration began to maneuver, and yet another "interpretation" of the treaty emerged--a "restrictive" interpretation. U.S. secretary of State G. Shultz declared the United States will implement its program while adhering to this "restrictive interpretation." What does the interpretation consist of? We will let White House spokesmen explain. Deputy Press Secretary L. Speakes: "We will adhere to the present interpretation, which the President has given. As he has repeatedly explained, this means research and testing." His White House colleague E. Djerejian: "The President is prepared to show restraint in implementing the SDI program in the form in which it is structurally determined at the present time... This is a very carefully worked out program which, as the President stated, includes research, testing, and development [razrabotka]."

There you have the real worth of the "restrictive interpretation"! Where is the "restraint" of which the U.S. spokesmen speak, if they immediately explain, quite unabashed, that both development [razrabotka] and testing will

be carried out during implementation of the program? After all, the ABM Treaty (Article 5) prohibits not only deploying, but also developing [sozdavat] and testing ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based. However, despite this clear prohibition, L. Speakes, for instance, proclaims to journalists at a press briefing that, in his opinion, "certain forms of tests are permitted" under the treaty.

All this means just one thing--the U.S. Administration intends to continue to violate the ABM Treaty under cover of its own so-called "restrictive interpretation" of its provisions, which is convenient for official Washington. It is not for nothing that THE WASHINGTON POST has written that the decision the administration has now announced marks only a "partial withdrawal" from the total change in the U.S. leadership's attitude to the ABM Treaty which was announced by R. McFarlane and which C. Weinberger "pressed hard" for. And, as THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, in the opinion of specialists outside the administration, neither of the two interpretations of the ABM Treaty--neither the "broad" interpretation nor the "restrictive" interpretation--is either really restrictive or entirely in accordance with the provision of the treaty.

Moreover, the U.S. Administration has not only failed to dissociate itself from R. McFarlane's statement, not only failed to disavow the "broad interpretation" of the treaty, but has actually shown total solidarity with it. It has been officially announced in Washington: The President has examined the recommendations and the reassessment of the treaty. We believe the broad interpretation is correct. However, the President has decided the United States must remain within the present bounds of the treaty, within the bounds of the present interpretation of the treaty, according to which there is no need to use--in order to attain our objectives--the broader version.

Two extremely worrying conclusions showing the dangers to the ABM Treaty follow from this. First, Washington has begun to regard the restrictions imposed by the treaty not as a national pledge, but merely as a "decision" by the U.S. President. At the moment, a "restrictive interpretation" of it (although even this contravenes the provisions of the treaty) suits the United States since, according to the timetable of the "Star Wars" program, the time has not come for full-scale tests of space-based ABM systems and components. The explanation turns out to be quite simple: As yet, there is no need to substantiate the U.S. right to virtually unrestricted tests, including tests involving the placement of systems and components in orbit. The President's national security assistant was merely in a hurry and jumped the gun, revealing the next U.S. position.

Second, at any moment the U.S. Administration may switch to the "broad interpretation" of the treaty, as soon as this is required by the developers of the "Star Wars" program. R. Perle has unambiguously intimated that President's present decision is temporary. "As for the future, time will tell," he said. And observers R. Evans and R. Novak wrote in THE WASHINGTON POST that the President's decision does not threaten work under the program. Supporters of the Pentagon, they report, are predicting that after the summit R. Reagan will lift the ban on full-scale research, development [razrabotka], and testing.

So there are no grounds for removing anxiety and, as Britain's FINANCIAL TIMES put it, "greeting with relief the explanations" of official Washington. However, clearly the only people to calm down in Western Europe are those who merely went through the motions of registering "indignation" at Washington's policy aimed at eroding the ABM Treaty. Take Bonn, for instance. The West German mass media have reported that the FRG Government "greeted with satisfaction Secretary of State G. Shultz' explanations and welcomed the U.S. readiness to comply with the treaty's provisions." Official Bonn was not in the least embarrassed that, in violation of the ABM Treaty, the United States is going to continue both the development [razrabotka] and testing of space strike arms.

But sober-minded figures in the U.S. allied countries are clearly still feeling alarmed and anxious. "European diplomats," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "note that in the long term the (U.S.) Administration's policy remains unclear." According to REUTER, "there is a chance of longer-term subversion of the restrictive measures" imposed by the treaty.

The essence of Washington's policy is that, by distorting the ABM Treaty, it is seeking to make the treaty fit in with its dangerous plans for the militarization of space. The various temporary ruses and tricks and attempts to create the appearance of some kind of "disagreement" inside the administration on the question of compliance with the treaty are nothing other than political maneuvering. The debate in the United States over this issue, THE NEW YORK TIMES emphasizes, "is diplomatic in nature, since specialists can see no way of rapidly changing the structure of the 'Star Wars' program and the program already envisages tests."

Of course, even in the United States there are politicians and public figures who are aware of the threat hanging over the ABM Treaty. Quite a few of them. Recently, six prominent politicians who held the post of U.S. Defense Secretary at various times--H. Brown, C. Clifford, M. Laird, R. McNamara, E. Richardson, and J. Schlesinger--called on President R. Reagan not to take any steps leading to an erosion of the treaty. Speaking in Congress the other day, Democratic Senator W. Proxmire declared that the President's commitment to the "Star Wars" program is a serious obstacle to progress in the sphere of arms reduction and limitation. The implementation of this program, the senator stressed, would lead to the undermining of the ABM Treaty, which he described as "maybe the best agreement in the arms control sphere signed by the two great powers."

The Soviet Union, as is well known, occupies a firm and consistent position on the question of the need for the sides to comply with the ABM Treaty. This Treaty is of fundamental importance to the entire arms limitation process. It is the foundation on which strategic stability and international security are based. The USSR is convinced that everyone, the United States included, will lose if the treaty is violated. It rigorously complies with all its commitments under the treaty and does nothing that would contravene its provisions.

The USSR believes it is necessary to ban all stages of the inception of space strike arms. This does not deny the right and potential to conduct

fundamental research in the area of space. To conduct quests and researches under laboratory condition is one thing, but it is something else entirely when mock-ups and prototypes are being created [sozdavat] and models of space arms are being tested. All this is always followed by the deployment of arms. That is why everything that is done for the subsequent design [konstruirovaniye] and production of space strike systems must be prohibited.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1100

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

GDR REPORTEDLY INVOLVED IN SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEM

LD251317 Hamburg DPA in German 1207 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn -- According to information in the possession of the Federal Government, the GDR is collaborating in Soviet plans for the development of a missile defense system in space. The government has confirmed this to CDU Bundestag Deputy Juergen Todenhoefer, who a while ago was accused by East Berlin of lying and slander for making this claim.

In reply to questions by Todenhoefer, Parliamentary State Secretary in the Defense Ministry Peter-Kurt Wuerzbach (CDU) said that at a meeting of the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet defense minister has urged all member states to participate in the planning, research, and development of a counterprogram to the U.S. SDI research project. The GDR was brought in several years ago into the development of an antisatellite weapons system.

According to available information, progress had been made in laser technology. The GDR had, among other things, special experience in the fields of picture signal transmission, precision mechanics, optical target systems, digital picture processing, and control techniques.

Commenting on the government's information, Todenhoefer said that this meant that the GDR's credibility in the international disarmament discussion had sunk to "way below zero."

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2536



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S RAU DISCUSSES SDI

DW250937 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1915 GMT 23 Oct 85

[Suhr] Western government heads are now negotiating and talking with President Reagan in New York about coordination before the Geneva summit meeting. What would you as a potential chancellor instruct the current chancellor to do?

[Rau] I am not supposed to instruct him. The position of the Social Democrats is clear. We hope, together with many, many people that success will be achieved in Geneva, that disarmament will get moving, and that the way to disarmament will not always pass through new rearmament spirals. We Social Democrats have clearly said that we do not consider SDI a possible solution. We agree on that with many European governments. We can only hope that new initiatives will emanate from Geneva, that Geneva will not be just a ritual, that danger will be lessened in Europe and worldwide. We are not merely unable to pay for the continued weapons momentum; we also cannot afford the cost to our security.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2535



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CRITICIZES FRG DEFENSE MINISTER'S NEWSWEEK REMARKS

LD011106 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 1 Oct 85

["In the Harness of Washington's Militarist Policy"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow 1 October TASS--TASS News Analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

At a time when the demands are being sounded the world over ever more loudly that the arms race be curbed and the slipping down to a nuclear catastrophe be stopped, in the aggressive bloc of NATO there are still some responsible figures who are prepared to dance to U.S. piping for any reason. This has been vividly evidenced by the interview of Manfred Woerner, the FRG's minister of defence. In the interview which is published in the latest issue of the U.S. "NEWSWEEK" magazine, he in every way justifies the Reagan administration's "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). The FRG's defence minister asserted, in particular, that the only real nuclear guarantee of the FRG's security now and in the foreseeable future will be ensured by the United States of America.

Woerner's pronouncements show once again that Bonn's top leadership, following in the wake of Washington's imperious course, in earnest expects to get an American "space shield" in the event of an "attack from the East." This is precisely what the West Europeans are being intimidated with by U.S. strategists who count on space-based anti-missile defences for the purpose of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies. In practice, however, the ominous plans which are being devised by the Pentagon for the conduct of the "Star Wars" lead only to the conversion of the old world into a possible theatre of "limited" nuclear war and place Western Europe in an unenviable position of a nuclear hostage of the U.S. military.

It is perfectly evident that the "Star Wars" programme in an undisguised form is aggressive to the utmost. It constitutes a venturesome attempt by U.S. imperialism to attach the USA's NATO partners to the U.S. nuclear-missile chariot. U.S. imperialism counts on the use of first-strike space arms for the establishment of U.S. domination in the world. The SDI programme will undoubtedly whip up the arms race in all directions and, it means, the war threat will grow and international tension will be heightened to the utmost. This is the first phase of a project to create a new anti-ballistic missile system which is banned by the appropriate treaty of 1972.

This is why the entire SDI programme and its so-called research part are a new, still more dangerous round of the arms race which will inevitably lead to a new aggravation of Soviet-U.S. relations. To avert that, it is essential to prevent an arms race in outer space.

To counterbalance the ominous "Star Wars" plans, the USSR has put forward the "Star Peace" concept before the international community. At the same time the Soviet Union has submitted to the U.N. General Assembly for consideration concrete proposals concerning the main directions and principles of large-scale international cooperation in the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space. This important proposal meets with growing support and approval of the world public and the international community as a whole.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1100

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CRITICISM OF SDI BY LONDON FORUM PARTICIPANTS NOTED

PM311657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Maslennikov under the rubric "Soviet Initiatives. Before the Geneva Meeting": "In Search of Their Own Role"]

[Text] London--The USSR's new peace initiatives are continuing to exert a profound influence on the public consciousness in West European countries, whose peoples are keenly aware of the nuclear war danger looming over them and therefore, are increasingly persistently seeking their own positions and ways and means accessible to them for preventing the menacing catastrophe.

The political experience acquired by the West Europeans in the decades since the war is increasingly convincing them that the line pursued by NATO's aggressive circles, at Washington's initiative and aimed at violent [silovaya] confrontation between West and East, dooms them to an exhausting and futile arms race, to lagging behind the United States economically, and ultimately, jeopardizes the very existence of European civilization. The danger of this course has become particularly obvious in recent years when, finding themselves on the other side of a barrage of U.S. cruise missiles and Pershing missiles, the U.S. West European allies not only failed to acquire the promised security, but were faced with the prospect of an even more unpredictable spiral of the arms race connected with Reagan's plans to militarize space.

In the prevailing situation an increasing number of British politicians and public figures are mentally returning to the period of detente. After all, it was this period which brought people not simply an easing of international tension and of the fear of war, but also tangible material benefits caused by the revival of economic and trade cooperation between West and East. That is why the idea voiced during the recent Soviet-French summit meeting regarding the need to review the prevailing political concepts and bring them into line with the new realities; to abandon attempts to ensure security with the aid of force; and to return to the path of detente, constructive dialogue; and all-European cooperation was welcomed with such favorable attention in the broadest strata of the British public.

"Transatlantic" relations have long been based on the tacit, but nonetheless utterly undisputed priority of U.S. military, political, and economic

interests over the interests of U.S. allies. Now many people here, including statesmen, justifiably fear that the U.S. Administration's persistent attempts to draw them into the implementation of programs for the militarization of space will inevitably lead to an unprecedented acceleration of the arms race, to the even greater destabilization of international relations, and to a corresponding comprehensive intensification of their dependence on their senior U.S. partner. "All critics," NEWSWEEK admitted recently, "agree that the respective clout of the United States and its allies within the framework of the North Atlantic alliance has become utterly incommensurate and this inequality is bad for both sides."

Many people in the West European NATO countries are outraged; primarily, by the dictatorial ways of their transatlantic partner, whose policy under the present administration is becoming increasingly aggressive and unpredictable. Noting the U.S. Government believes it has the right to impose its own homegrown concepts of political conduct on everyone, the well-known British politician E. Powell wrote recently in THE GUARDIAN: "The British public, with its relatively mild and liberal attitude toward other peoples, has difficulty in comprehending the United States' manic adherence to its view of the world..."

Washington's foreign policy actions, D. Watt, former director of the Royal Institute of International Relations, echoes him in THE TIMES, are as a rule, dictated by the changeability of the situation within the country and they are therefore utterly unpredictable.

"The 'Star Wars' initiative," Watt continues, "is the most crass and damaging of these acts...The United States' allies and states dependent on it simply cannot rely on U.S. policy remaining consistent and are obliged...to work out their own positions accordingly."

The West European NATO countries' caution with regard to their U.S. partner is growing as U.S. attempts to drag them into the implementation of the "Star Wars" program become more importunate. The Soviet program for "Star Peace" and a radical reduction of nuclear weapons on earth is attracting attention as opening up a real opportunity for emerging from the dangerous deadlock.

All this was seriously discussed at the international conference held in London recently to discuss the political, military-strategic, and technical problems of the "Star Wars" program.

"Nuclear weapons are sometimes called technology that is getting out of people's control," Professor (J. Ruina) of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a well known U.S. scientist, said from the conference rostrum. "I personally believe that the 'Star Wars' program is a policy that has gotten out of the control of sensible people." Not only an absolute majority of scientists in the United States but many professional military men believe the "Strategic Defense Initiative" to be technically impracticable and politically dangerous, the professor affirmed.

"They are trying to convince us," Professor P. (Rodgers) of Bradford University stated on behalf of British scientists, "that the creation of a space-based ABM defense according to the U.S. President's recipe will lead to

reductions in and the virtual elimination of nuclear weapons. In fact, implementation of the program will result in nuclear arsenals growing still further with corresponding increase in the danger of a destructive military conflict."

"Those who believe the Soviet Union can be brought to its knees by imposing a new round in the arms race on it," P. Warnke, former head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated from the London forum rostrum, "understand nothing of Soviet policy or of international affairs as a whole. We must welcome the new Soviet initiatives, which are opening the way to nuclear arms reductions, particularly in Europe. The way to peace does not lie in creating illusory space shields, but in reaching agreement with the Soviet Union on establishing controls over nuclear arms at the lowest possible level."

"We must reject the concept that promotion of the 'Star Wars' program may help in reaching an agreement at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva," L. (Fridmen), the well known British specialist on military-strategic questions, said. "This program will have an adverse influence on the West European states' position, since it may divert their attention from the fundamental political questions on whose solution the maintenance of peace and stability on our continent depends."

The ever mounting criticism of the U.S. "Star Wars" program in West European countries, the growth of demands being made on the governments of the NATO countries to provide a constructive response to the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives, and the call to return to the path of detente and cooperation cannot fail to also influence the Western countries' ruling circles. In the speeches of leading figures of the capitalist countries, including Britain, there have recently been increasingly frequent notes of anxiety at the fact that the West is "losing the battle for people's minds," West Europeans are starting, however, to realize more profoundly that looking attractive purely in terms of propaganda is not enough today. "M. Thatcher and Chancellor H. Kohl, not to mention the U.S. President," the newspaper THE GUARDIAN wrote the other day, "are making a big mistake if they think the problem is just one of words."

The conviction is taking root in the public consciousness that talks about disarmament must be followed by action aimed at genuinely improving the entire system of international relations and asserting detente and constructive cooperation among the peoples.

/12913  
CS0: 5200/1100

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

USSR NOTES HOUSE VOTE--The House of Representatives of the American Congress has approved the allocation of \$2,500 million for the "Star Wars" program in the current fiscal year. The money is to be spent on specific projects as part of the development of an antiballistic missile defense. A number of congressmen voted against the bill, arguing that United States' efforts in this field violate the treaty with the Soviet Union on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems. [LD311730 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 31 Oct 85]

12913

CSO: 5200/1100



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### FRG PAPERS COMMENT ON REAGAN'S UN ADDRESS

Viewed as Preview to Geneva

DW281411 Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 26-27 Oct 85 p 3

[Hans Ulrich Kempfski dispatch from New York: "Summit Fever on the East River"]

[Excerpts] Before Reagan arrived in New York on Wednesday, he had let it be known that much more was to be expected from him than a mere anniversary speech. He said that with a view to his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev he wanted to use the opportunity to demonstrate worldwide that as President of the United States he was willing on principle to submit to the CPSU general secretary constructive, new proposals for the Geneva summit. Therefore, expectations were high. The White House announced that Reagan would meet Gorbachev halfway.

Fifteen hours before Reagan delivered his speech, it became clear, however, that his reaction would not be to enhance optimism but to cause irritation: Reagan's security adviser Robert McFarlane had briefed the press on the substance of the President's speech. Reagan's central topic would not be arms limitation, McFarlane said, but an initiative for the settlement of regional conflicts. What is meant by that was explained to the journalists in an 8-page document: Reagan demands from Gorbachev an end to Soviet influence in those five countries which as hotbeds of crisis are apt to "poison" U.S.-Soviet relations; namely, Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Nicaragua.

Initial reactions to Reagan's statements show that a failure of the Geneva summit must be expected, because apparently nothing about Reagan's traditionally negative attitude toward the Soviet Union has changed. The only thing that has changed is Reagan's language. He does not attack the Soviet Union carelessly with blunt directness any more; he attacks it quite gently and cautiously, almost gracefully. In that respect his speech is a rhetoric masterpiece. It is replete with terms that have a lulling effect: soul, freedom, hearts, pride, life, morality, God's children. Without being afraid of repetition Reagan uses the word "peace" 24 times. At the end he even uses formulas which sound so optimistic as if in the final analysis he was prepared after all to come to terms with Gorbachev.

However, it is not difficult to learn the truth. The U.S. and the Soviet Union's tactical positions are very different. Yet the U.S. negotiating position has not yet been completely formulated. The hardliners among Reagan's advisers are very influential. They are obviously also very strong. Reagan does not want to give up his longstanding positions. However, he also increasingly thinks about what will be

his image in contemporary history. Therefore, he wants to make the Geneva summit a personal success. However, he does not yet have a strategy to achieve this. He fears that the summit meeting will get stuck in an adverse climate, without anything being achieved. Then the risk to Reagan would be great, that is, at the end of the four rounds of talks scheduled in Geneva as well as two working dinners of unlimited duration there will be no fixed point by which the success or failure could be judged.

#### Seeking Change in Relations

DW281334 Bonn DIE WELT in German 28 Oct 85 p 2

[Article by Fritz Wirth: "Reagan's Speech: Not a Disturbing Factor But a New Beginning"]

[Text] In the period just before the Geneva summit it is not easy to determine the basic topics and the chances of success of the meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev. To some people these difficulties of ascertainment have been increased since the President's New York speech. They regard his speech, with its initiative for the solution of regional conflicts ranging from Afghanistan to Angola, as a tactical "ricochet" aimed at creating a sidetrack theater for Geneva, diverting the spotlight from the arms control problems, and putting the Soviets -- who so far have been very aggressive in this matter -- on the defensive. Other observers, and these include leading German politicians, have tried to tone down the international impact of the speech by pointing out that it was intended for the domestic American market.

Both interpretations are determined by the apprehension that the President might try to relegate progress in arms control issues very far in the future through a "linkage" of arms control with the Afghanistans of this world. Thus, there are uncertainties and insinuations left which obstruct a realistic assessment of the Geneva summit. But what are the possibilities of that meeting? Above all, what is the U.S. position and the U.S. strategy for Geneva?

Reagan will not be going to Geneva hoping that he could negotiate a new disarmament agreement with Gorbachev in 9 hours of talks. Experience shows that such agreements take years. The best that can be achieved on the subject in Geneva is that both government heads are capable of dismantling the walls which have stopped the agreements reached to date. Such a hope is justified and gives cause for a certain optimism.

However, Ronald Reagan wants more: He proposes to raise the entire relationship with Moscow to a new level; he wants to set up guidelines jointly with Gorbachev for the development of East-West relations.

The guidelines must not be too narrow and they should not leave room only for arms control discussions or even for political and diplomatic one-way traffic. That is the background of his New York speech. He desires a new beginning in the relationship with Moscow because he wants to create an environment in which armament agreements have a chance to take hold. What Reagan pursues in Geneva is not to win by points, or even to score a "knockout" against Gorbachev -- he wants the end of the "fight" with the Kremlin.

He does not demand the impossible of the Soviets, for instance, that they change their system or neglect their security needs. He wants nothing else but a normal situation. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the role of Cuban soldiers in Angola, the regime-backed by Vietnamese soldiers in Cambodia -- all this is highly abnormal. Why should

the attempt to change that become a "disturbing factor?" After all, it is those hot-beds of unrest that have become a disturbing factor for treaties with the Soviet Union. The SALT II treaty, for example, was born amid the tension generated by the invasion of Afghanistan. Granted, the treaty is alive, but it has never gone beyond the incubation stage. Reagan wants to prevent that kind of agreement.

Hence, it is advisable to take seriously Reagan's New York speech and his initiative for the solution of regional conflicts. Anyone interpreting them as a tactical maneuver tailored to fit home use only, runs the risk of misunderstanding the President's entire concept of Ostpolitik.

Decisive parts of that concept clearly reveal the handwriting of Richard Nixon, whom Reagan consulted several times. Nixon's article in the latest issue of FOREIGN AFFAIRS contains the passage that forms the basis of Reagan's new initiative toward solving regional conflicts: "It is necessary to make headway in arms control and in political topics at the same time. Headway in arms control may well lead to stability and to reduction in political tensions. Reductions in political tensions may well lead to a better climate for arms control agreements that are fair for both sides."

Thus, it is not the "linkage," but the "parallelism" that constitutes the decisive criterion for Reagan's Geneva strategy. Such long-term relaxation in relations with the East is inherent in the logic of Reagan's new defense strategy. He cannot and will not impose his strategy on the Soviets, but needs the dialogue with the Soviets, especially in the second phase, when SDI collides directly with the ABM treaty. It is Reagan's objective to create an environment that will make such a dialogue possible.

The idle talk of the "disturbing factor" and of the "ricochet from New York" that accompanied Reagan's New York speech is, therefore, out of place. The speech is part of a new, positive foreign-policy architecture.

#### Need For Clear Concept Noted

DW281406 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 26 Oct 85 p 3

[Pierre Simonitch New York dispatch: "Lacking Concept"]

[Text] The summit meeting of the most important Western states convoked in New York by the U.S. President has caused confusion rather than contributing to clarification. Perhaps the French were right in staying away. Serious differences of opinion within the U.S. Government about future policies toward the Soviet Union allow a Western consensus merely on the smallest common denominator. Messrs Kohl, Craxi, Nakasone, and Mulroney as well as the Lady Thatcher expressed to Ronald Reagan "their full support for his talks in Geneva" with Soviet party boss Mikhail Gorbachev -- whatever this may mean.

The differences in U.S. Government quarters was also reflected by Reagan's speech to the UN General Assembly. Granted, such speeches are spoken into the wind and are essentially tailored to meet domestic policy needs. Nevertheless, what is missing in the U.S. President's statements is the leitmotif or a signal directed to Moscow. The Soviets immediately returned the fire. They do not find anything new in Reagan's speech except the mere confirmation of the hard U.S. course in all world political affairs.

True, the background talks conducted with the press spokesmen of the participants in the Western summit did not help at all to determine what really is to form the key issue at the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting due to be held 4 weeks from now. So far, people believed

that what primarily mattered was a disarmament agreement. Now suddenly, it is said that the solution of regional conflicts and the observance of the human rights are to be given equal weight and parallel importance with questions concerning arms control. Laudable as these intentions may seem, they nevertheless harbor the danger of making the laboriously achieved dialogue ooze in all directions like pulp.

It has not become clear, either, whether the United States makes an arms control agreement dependent on headway in the other fields. The European participants in the Western summit did not understand Reagan's elucidations that way. Reagan's supreme security adviser, Robert McFarlane, hinted to newsmen in contrast that there is indeed a connection between the individual issues. Radical reduction in nuclear weapons requires a settlement of the different regional conflicts as a precondition.

Versed observers immediately found the hitch: "The U.S. Government so far has not mapped out a concept of a reply to the latest Soviet proposals concerning arms control. The allies, foremost of all British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, urge the U.S. Government to make concrete counterproposals lest the initiative slide entirely into Soviet hands. However, in Washington, the already traditional quarrel between hawks and doves is raging. The forces desiring a reasonable agreement with Moscow have the upper hand now, although they are not yet sure of their victory. The President will have to make a personal decision in the near future. According to top echelon sources the United States intends to publicly present disarmament proposals even prior to the Geneva summit meeting.

Hopefully, these planned proposals will put an end to the puzzlement over the U.S. intentions. Getting back to the essentials again does not mean that the leading of the two most powerful nations in the world have to leave the other problems aside. In all tacitness, talks on the different regional hotbeds of crisis were opened as early as in the spring. High-ranking U.S. and Soviet diplomats took a close look at the situation in Afghanistan, Central America, and Southeast Asia. It would be most unreasonable to create a linkage now between questions of different nature and significance. Reaffirmation of the rules of good behavior between states, if taken seriously, may well stake out the framework for subsequent negotiations.

/12858

CSO: 5200/2535



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### FRC'S KOHL MEETS REAGAN, SHEVARDNADZE IN NEW YORK

#### Comments on Reagan Meeting

LD251802 Hamburg DPA in German 1711 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] New York, 25 Oct (DPA) -- Following a talk with U.S. President Reagan, Chancellor Helmut Kohl said in New York today: "I am sure that the American-Soviet summit in Geneva will have a positive outcome." At a press conference the chancellor spoke about Reagan's wish to put East-West relations "on a more stable and long-term basis."

In the talk, which Kohl described as an intensive exchange of views, the chancellor once again put forth the German view on the maintenance of the ABM treaty and urged discussion of a worldwide prohibition on chemical weapons and of the Vienna negotiations on troop reductions at the Geneva summit.

On SDI research he made it clear to the U.S. President about the FRC's support and also said that a decision by the Federal Government on a formal framework agreement will be reached by the end of the year.

#### Report on Shevardnadze Meeting

LD260043 Hamburg DPA in German 2334 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] New York, 25 Oct (DPA) -- Following an exchange of views with the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in New York on Friday which lasted nearly 2 hours, Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl saw his "cautious optimism" confirmed concerning a successful summit. During the talk, which government spokesman Friedhelm Ost said was friendly and open, the Soviet foreign minister emphasized that in international politics there was at present "nothing more important" than the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva on 19 and 20 November.

Informed sources said about the Kohl-Shevardnadze talk that differences of opinion continue to dominate the area of medium-range missiles in Europe and the SDI project. The Soviet foreign minister expressed clear skepticism concerning the American plans for space missile defense, after Kohl had described the conviction with which U.S. President Reagan was favoring (?arms control) accords in Geneva. (?During the talk, dominated above all by disarmament problems) Shevardnadze also mentioned the Soviet (?willingness) to (?address), at least in principle, the difficult verification question, (?such as for a ban on chemical weapons).

During the talk in the federal chancellor's hotel suite over coffee, which was described as very relaxed, Genscher assured his Soviet colleague that the West would be submitting detailed counterproposals concerning the latest Soviet (?proposals) and also would refer to the reduction of strategic strike weapons.

#### Discusses Upcoming Summit

LD271533 Hamburg DPA in German 1508 GMT 27 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn, 27 Oct (DPA) -- According to Chancellor Helmut Kohl, the forthcoming Geneva superpower summit will provide an important impetus for solutions in the central problem areas between East and West.

In an interview with the newspaper DIE WELT (Monday edition), Kohl says he gained the conviction in the United States that President Reagan wants to hold a dialogue with the (?East) over a broad range of topics. Reagan wants, together with Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, "to provide an impetus for lasting and better East-West relations at the summit."

In his discussions with Reagan, he brought the specific German and West European interests in summit preparations. In his talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, he also gained the impression that the Soviet side is now ready to negotiate seriously in Geneva.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2535



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENTS ON MID-OCTOBER MEETING OF NATO FOREIGN MINISTERS

U.S. 'Did Not Want Conference'

LD150937 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Posledniye IZVESTIYA commentary as read by Viktor Levin]

[Text] Tomorrow in Brussels an extraordinary meeting of NATO foreign ministers is being held. As a representative from the Belgian Ministry of External Relations reported, it will be devoted to East-West relations and the new Soviet proposals on limiting armaments. Here is a POSLEDNIYE IZVESTIYA commentary; at the microphone is Viktor Levin:

Just two weeks ago there were no plans for an extraordinary conference of NATO foreign ministers. The question of such a meeting arose only after Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, speaking in Paris, set out new, far-reaching Soviet proposals for the reduction of nuclear weapons--both strategic and medium-range. And this question arose at the initiative of Belgium and the Netherlands. The United States, as is well known, had intended to discuss issues connected with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting at summit level at a narrow conference of representatives of the seven major capitalist powers. But the small NATO countries on this occasion were not prepared to reconcile themselves to Washington's intention to present them with a fait accompli, and the new Soviet initiatives prompted them to take up an active position. And it is not by chance that in the telegrams of the Western news agencies one frequently comes across the phrase that the extraordinary conference in Brussels is being convened at the insistence of Belgium and the Netherlands; at the insistence, because the United States did not want such a conference at all.

This is a new and very interesting element. The Belgian representative, describing his country's position, said outright that the Soviet proposals are a starting point which deserve the most careful examination. This concerns the question of the Soviet proposals on medium-range nuclear weapons. Our country currently has 243 SS-20 missiles on alert duty [boyevoye dezhurstvo] in the European zone. This means that the number corresponds exactly to the level of June 1984 too, when the supplementary siting of our missiles was begun in response to the installation of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. In imposing such a self-restriction, Comrade Gorbachev said, we are

guided by the wide interests of European security. I think that Europe now has the right to expect a reciprocal move from the United States: a halt to the further siting of their medium-range missiles on the European Continent. The reaction of the small NATO countries, which has manifested itself so actively--I mean their demand for the immediate convocation of an extraordinary conference to exchange opinions and work out a coordinated position--clearly shows that the Soviet initiatives have made a strong impression on them. And the fact that the United States was unable to ignore their demand reflects a new situation in Western Europe.

#### Meeting Opens

LD161904 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 15 Oct 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Experts reject Atlantic, and first and foremost American, assertions about a threat from the East. However, it must be said that both NATO propaganda and policy continue, as before, to be based on precisely these absurd assertions. This is graphically displayed in the work of the third forum which opened today, the extraordinary session of the NATO Council in Brussels. Consultations are being held here in connection with the new Soviet proposals on issues of disarmament. [Video shows delegates arriving at NATO headquarters]

As you may recall, comrades, at first it was proposed to conduct discussion of these questions only at the conference of the so-called "Big Seven" in Washington with leaders of the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Canada, Italy, and Japan taking part. As is known, however, President Mitterrand refused to take part in such a meeting. Besides, small NATO countries--first and foremost Belgium and Holland--felt they had been left out, and expressed their dissatisfaction in no uncertain terms. As a result, the scale of the Atlantic meeting was expanded, and indeed the very fact that it is being held testifies to the enormous interest which the new Soviet peace initiatives have aroused in Western Europe.

Here are a few notable utterances by the Western European press: The Bonn GENERAL-ANZEIGER writes--Europeans are insisting on a constructive response to the Soviet proposals, and their use at the negotiating table; the British paper THE GUARDIAN expressed itself in a similar vein--it writes about the fact--and I quote--that European NATO member-countries, alarmed at the negative reply to the Soviet proposals by the U.S. Administration, call upon President Reagan to include his Star Wars program in the agenda for the Geneva talks.

#### NATO Supports Talks With USSR

LD152005 Moscow TASS in English 1933 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Text] Brussels 15 October TASS--West European allies of the United States in the NATO block today recommended that the U.S. should not throw out the new Soviet proposals on disarmament but make them the basis of talks. This

is one of the main results of the NATO council special session at the level of foreign ministers here.

The U.S. partners in the alliance urged Washington to abide by the arms limitation agreements signed earlier between the Soviet Union and the United States. They declared for using the Soviet-U.S. summit, due to be held in Geneva in November, to foster constructive bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States. It follows, however, from the statement by George Schultz, U.S. secretary of state, at a press conference on the results of the session, that Washington does not intend to heed the calls of its NATO allies and embark on the course of reaching fair accords with the Soviet Union.

#### NATO, U.S. Views Contrasted

LD160911 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Text] Brussels 15 October TASS--The Soviet disarmament proposals "can be used as a basis for talks." This has been stressed by the Minister of External Relations of Belgium Leo Tindemans who spoke at the emergency session of the NATO Council on the level of ministers of foreign affairs that was held here today. According to L. Tindemans, the Soviet initiative is a possibility of a dialogue and progress in the future. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of West Germany Hans-Dietrich Genscher pointed out in his report that the West "should respond in a constructive way to the initiative of Mikhail Gorbachev on disarmament questions" which he had put forward during his visit to France.

The very fact of the holding of the session of the NATO Council is evidence of the lively interest evoked by the new Soviet initiatives, especially in Western. [sentence as received] This obviously worried the U.S. Administration.

The allies urged the U.S. to adhere to the arms limitation agreements concluded earlier by the USSR and the U.S., specifically, the ABM treaty. They also went on record in favour of constructive bilateral Soviet-American relations. However, the reports of the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz made at the session and at the press conference on its results created the impression that Washington was not going to heed very much to the appeals of its NATO partners. G. Shultz did not give any guarantees to the U.S. allies that the U.S. Administration would give up the striving for military superiority and would seek to reach just, equitable and honest agreements with the Soviet Union.

#### Shultz 'Looked Embarrassed'

LD162326 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 16 Oct 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] Western capitals cannot but take into account the wide response aroused by the new peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union. The West

European allies of the United States in the NATO bloc are increasing pressure on Washington to take a serious attitude to the Soviet proposals and to take them as the basis for the coming talks in Geneva.

This was shown by the extraordinary session of the NATO Council in Brussels, where Secretary of State Shultz found he was practically isolated. The majority of participants at the session called on the White House to keep to the agreements on arms limitation previously concluded between the United States and the USSR and stressed the importance of starting constructive bilateral Soviet-American relations. Washington certainly did not expect this kind of pressure, and at the concluding press conference in the Belgian capital, Shultz looked clearly embarrassed. Will the White House listen to the appeals of its NATO allies? The near future will show.

#### PRAVDA Commentary

PM161500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Drobkov dispatch: "Indoctrinating the Allies"]

[Text] Brussels, 15 October--An extraordinary session of the NATO Council opened here today, and the foreign ministers of the North Atlantic alliance member countries have gathered here for it. It is being held at the request of Belgium and the Netherlands, which proposed a discussion within the bloc framework of the West's joint reaction to the new Soviet proposals formulated by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his official visit to France.

The very fact that such a session is taking place and the events preceding it testify to the profound impact of the Soviet initiatives on public opinion and political circles in the Western states.

Under these circumstances Washington has to maneuver and try to enlist from its closest partners the strongest possible support for its "Star Wars" plans and the continuation of the arms race. The failure of the U.S. administration's initial plan to convene a "restricted" meeting of leaders from the main Western countries on the eve of the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, without even inviting all the allies to it, is highly indicative in this connection.

This idea aroused criticism and resistance from many Western states. France categorically refused to participate in it. The junior NATO partners, insulted by the refusal to invite them, loudly proclaimed their dissatisfaction with this gesture by Washington, which clearly demonstrated that it is prepared to look upon some states merely as convenient launchpads for new nuclear missiles. The Belgian and Netherlands foreign ministers sent a special message to Washington proposing consultations within the NATO framework with all its members taking part.

The United States deemed it prudent not to tread any more on its allies' corns, but it also made it clear at the same time that it expects them to

accept the U.S. approach to the current Soviet initiatives and the forthcoming talks in Geneva at the Brussels meeting. In order to ensure that the NATO partners are not tempted to take an independent stance, Washington dispatched high-ranking emissaries to West Europe in good time. P. Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms reduction talks, and R. Perle, assistant to the Pentagon's chief, visited a number of capitals.

During their stay in Belgium, in statements to NATO countries' ambassadors, and at P. Nitze's press conference at the U.S. mission to NATO the American representatives portrayed the Soviet initiatives in a distorted light and went on about the "unilateral advantages" they supposedly bring for the USSR and about the need to continue the military race for the sake of "Atlantic solidarity."

Now U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and the Washington emissaries accompanying him are intensively indoctrinating their bloc allies behind the tightly closed doors of NATO's headquarters in Brussels. They are trying at all costs to prevent "disarray and vacillation" in the North Atlantic camp and to ensure a continuation of the course of transforming West Europe into a convenient "theater of military operations."

/12913

CSO: 4200/1107



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S KOHL DISCUSSES NEW YORK TALKS, GENEVA SUMMIT

DW281341 Bonn DIE WELT in German 28 Oct 85 p 4

[Interview with Chancellor Helmut Kohl by correspondent Manfred Schell; date and place not given]

[Text] WELT: What results can be expected from a realistic assessment of the Geneva summit meeting?

Kohl: Generally, my talks with the U.S. President were positive. Picking New York as the venue for the talks was a good idea because we had the opportunity to meet numerous important discussion partners from all over the world. I was able to make use of that opportunity.

President Reagan wants the Geneva summit meeting to be successful. He is making very serious personal preparations for the meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev. The President showed great preparedness in the New York consultations with the Western partners in his move to incorporate their problems and proposals in his concepts and to make himself the spokesman of the West.

I do not doubt that he will represent the interests of the allies, and particularly of the FRG in its special situation as did President Mitterrand during General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to Paris. The Soviet side must have gotten the impression from all that happened in New York that the West will act in solidarity and cohesion.

I was convinced in New York that the President wants to take up the dialogue with the East in all its breadth, including arms control talks and in the economic and cultural fields, and that he wants, together with General Secretary Gorbachev, to initiate at the summit meeting lasting and improved East-West relations.

In his UN speech, Reagan viewed the Soviet proposals on the Geneva negotiations positively. In so doing, he stressed his will to use Soviet ideas in a serious process of give and take together with the U.S. proposals as a basis for the necessary decisions. Certainly, I warn against false illusions. However, in a realistic assessment of the changes, I am hopeful that the Geneva summit will produce important initiatives for lasting solutions to the central problems; it could be the first of several meetings of a continuing dialogue at the highest level.

WELT: How seriously will President Reagan consider the Europeans proposals?



Kohl: The Europeans and particularly the Federal Government played a significant role from the very beginning of preparations for the summit meeting. The Western alliance partners have created important prerequisites for the summit meeting. Since the beginning of my term of office I decidedly supported such a meeting whenever I was in Moscow or in Washington. I feel that developments have justified my efforts. The European allies -- not least the Federal Government -- have made their contribution to ensure that the Salt II treaty continues and is considered as binding by East and West. The role we played in the decision to keep strategic defense system research within the framework of restrictive definitions of the ABM treaty's significant stipulations cannot be ignored.

In my talks with the U.S. President I outlined our specific German and West European interests as new accents in the summit meeting preparations. In that connection, I met with open preparedness by President Reagan to consider our problems regarding the West.

It is necessary to stabilize the political dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union through regular meetings and to intensify it on a broad basis at all levels. That should mean important initiatives for East-West relations as a whole. It concerns the following fields:

1. The arms control talks in Geneva;
2. Negotiations on a worldwide ban on chemical weapons;
3. Efforts for an agreement on security and confidence-building measures between East and West;
4. Trade and economics and environmental protection problems going beyond the borders; and
5. The human rights problem.

I again pointed out to the U.S. President our concern that in the arms control negotiations the greatest possible decrease, if not elimination, of the threat emanating from Soviet SS-20 missiles and Soviet short-range nuclear systems deployed in the CSSR and GDR should be achieved. I met with understanding that the short-range systems in particular must be considered in any decision and that the FRG and Western Europe must not become zones of lesser security.

I made it clear that the West must analyze carefully the Soviet disarmament proposals, that the positive aspects of the proposals must be accepted, and the Western counterproposals must be made at the summit. The U.S. President said in New York that he was willing to begin a give and take process in the arms control field. In my intense talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze I gained the impression that the Soviet side is now prepared to seriously negotiate in Geneva.

WELT: What now is your attitude toward SDI since your talks with President Reagan? When and how will a decision be made?

Kohl: After the talks with the U.S. President, we in the FRG will make the necessary decisions by the end of the year. I want to make it clear that the decisions will involve only the problem of cooperation procedures of German firms and research institutions in SDI research work. The actual decision on SDI as a strategic defense system can only be made in the early nineties at the earliest, when research results are available. Only after thorough consultations with allies -- and possibly after negotiations on a cooperative solution with the Soviet Union -- can such decisions be made.

WELT: Is a change of the ABM treaty necessary to pursue SDI research or conduct tests?

Kohl: Secretary of State Shultz stressed at the NATO foreign ministers' special conference on 15 October that research and the necessary laboratory tests for the U.S. strategic defense system are being kept within the framework of the current interpretation of the ABM treaty as represented by the U.S. Government and the Western allies. That was affirmed by President Reagan. In the talks between the allies and the President in New York, we agreed that another interpretation of the ABM treaty, even if it were possible, is out of the question without first consulting with the allies.

Even the Soviet side, which has conducted research in the sphere of strategic defense for years, does not seriously maintain that research and laboratory tests contradict the ABM treaty. Therefore, the question for changing the ABM treaty has not arisen.

WELT: Do you expect Moscow to be flexible in general?

Kohl: My talk with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze took place in a good atmosphere. We discussed German-Soviet relations and East-West relations, including arms control problems. I use the opportunity to emphasize German and European interests vis-à-vis the Soviets. A special role was played by the fact that the FRG and Western Europe have an equal right to security, and that zones of lesser security -- as would be created by the various imbalanced Soviet proposals involving U.S. and Soviet intermediate range missiles -- are unacceptable.

I mentioned the Soviet foreign minister's remarks to the effect that the USSR hopes that a basic arms control agreement will be achieved at the summit. From the impression to me that the Soviet side is willing to continue to conduct negotiations with the Western States.

As a whole, I am of the opinion that the Soviet side is aware of the shortcomings and insufficiencies of the Soviet economic system. Gorbachev wants to achieve economic progress in the coming years. He also wants to raise the standard of living in the Soviet Union and to achieve political stability. He wants to save the country from higher weaponry expenditures. Therefore, Reagan and the allies are aware of the chances that may arise in this respect for disarmament negotiations.

/12858

CSO: 5200/2535

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV LETTER TO FRG EXPLAINS USSR'S SUMMIT STANCE

LD301116 Hamburg DPA in German 0950 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Text] Bonn, 30 Oct (DPA) -- Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev has explained to the Federal Government the Soviet attitude to the forthcoming summit meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The description of the position is contained in a letter from Gorbachev to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, which Soviet Ambassador Vladimir Semenov handed over in the chancellery on Tuesday. No information was officially given on the content of the letter, which Kohl's foreign policy adviser Horst Teltschik received. It is assumed in Bonn that Kohl will today report to the cabinet on the letter.

Gorbachev's letter reportedly represents a reply to Kohl, who informed the Soviet side about Bonn's desires for the negotiations between the Soviets and Americans at the beginning of October. Gorbachev gave the first explanations of the Soviet proposals on disarmament and arms control during his recent visit to Paris.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2535

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### FRG'S HANDELSBLATT ON APPROACH TO GENEVA SUMMIT

DW290825 Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 28 Oct 85 p 2

[Editorial by Viola Herms Drath: "Other Priorities"]

[Text] Washington -- If it was President Reagan's intention to deflect interest from the disarmament issue accentuated by Moscow prior to the Geneva summit conference on 19 November to other fields needing detente, he has succeeded only halfway. What the world expected was a concrete reaction to Mikhail Gorbachev's plan to nip the U.S. SDI in the bud through a tempting offer to cut the offensive strategic weapons arsenals by 50 percent.

The allies assembled in New York hoped in vain for a White House reaction to the newest, considerably changed, fourth version of a temporary freeze on intermediate-range missiles in Europe and Asia. The USSR's concept of a separate control agreement for intermediate-range missiles is Moscow's first deviation from the concept of linkage to the three-pronged Geneva talks. The new, softer wave may be interpreted as a move to drive a wedge between Washington and its NATO partners. However, it is also imaginable that the Kremlin leadership, in order to catch up economically and technologically, might instead be interested in the quick success of the negotiations.

But instead the U.S. President invoking the "Reagan Doctrine," concentrated on stressing the connection between disarmament and Soviet conduct in the world. That doctrine demands anticommunist revolutions "on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua" as a counterbalance to the Brezhnev Doctrine, according to which everything that has been in Soviet hands will remain in the Soviet orbit.

The fact that Reagan emphasized the crises caused by Soviet intervention, even though he said not a word about human rights violations and political suppression, provoked Moscow to voice harsh criticism of U.S. "international banditry."

The concerned allies did not like very much the timing of the crusade against Soviet imperialism as a preview to the Geneva summit. It was up to the allies to convince the U.S. President of the necessity for a clear Western arms control initiative.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher insisted on new packaging for the U.S. disarmament proposals, while Chancellor Helmut Kohl wanted a precise restrictive definition of the 1972 ABM treaty that is, more effective verification methods, confidence-building measures and information supplied to the allies about the summit's results.

Despite the obvious preparedness of Moscow and Washington to negotiate, expectations about a breakthrough in arms control seem to be limited on both sides. Moscow fosters

moderate hopes of negotiating an "agreement in principle," while Washington, frustrated by the Soviets' complex arithmetic, is striving for a starting point to work out further agreements.

As anyone could see from the debate on the interpretation of the ABM treaty, much time and energy has been invested in eliminating the differences of opinion between the Pentagon pessimists, who recall the catastrophic consequences of the 1961 meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev, and the civilian U.S. State Department strategists who are working for an improved East-West climate.

Washington has invested as much political and moral prestige as Moscow. Undoubtedly, Reagan and Gorbachev would prefer to return from Geneva with a halfway acceptable arms control agreement, rather than with a fallback cultural, technical, and scientific exchange program.

Despite all the preparedness to compromise, neither of the superpowers will accept a reduction of strategic or tactical weapons that would set one-sided limitations in concrete, or create new imbalances. Despite his strong conservative creed, Reagan has turned out repeatedly to be a pragmatist who is skilled in political deals in which all give up something to gain something else. Despite Moscow's rhetoric, Gorbachev appears to be flexible.

The question raised in Washington was whether an atmosphere can develop in Geneva permitting a compromise without loss of face. The same question is asked by Soviet diplomats who are not very interested in a meeting that would be considered routine in the history of summit meetings.

/12858

CSO: 5200/2535

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S GENSCHER OUTLINES EXPECTATIONS FROM SUMMIT TALKS

LD250837 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0800 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] Cologne: Federal Foreign Minister Genscher has said that after the Western summit in New York the Federal Government sees its opinion confirmed that the United States will make intensive efforts in Geneva for substantive talks with the Soviet Union. Genscher told Deutschlandfunk early this morning that the United States is aiming at the meeting between President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev to achieve at least the conditions for further progress. Genscher said that to talk about the whole field of relations and not to restrict East-West relations to disarmament definitely corresponds to German and European expectations.

Also on Deutschlandfunk early today, foreign policy spokesman of the SPD Bundestag group Karsten Voigt expressed the view that the Bonn Government's view on Washington's political decisions has diminished. According to Voigt, it is an illusion for Europeans to believe that Europe's will can be forced upon the United States. He warned that at the Geneva summit European interests might not be sufficiently taken into account.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2535



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG NEWSPAPER ON KOHL'S OPTIMISM ABOUT EAST-WEST TIES

DW281323 Munich SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 28 Oct 85 p 4

[Article by "DR": "Kohl's Premature Optimism"]

[Text] It may be assumed that the optimism Chancellor Kohl is spreading in the wake of his talks in New York is meant above all for domestic consumption in the FRG. The facts of the matter do not, for the time being, appear to justify such overconfidence.

Since President Reagan was not even able to give the six European heads of government who had made the pilgrimage to meet him a detailed description of the preparations leading up to his meeting with CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev, it is too early to assume that the Geneva summit will "lend far-reaching impetus to all areas of the East-West dialogue."

As far as Bonn is in a position to judge, one cannot even ascertain with what degree of firmness and flexibility the U.S. President will be entering the negotiations. The fact that as the meeting approaches Washington is interpreting the so-called ABM treaty on missile defense at all must be disquieting to the allies. They cannot even be satisfied with the version most favorable to them -- that although the treaty allows both research and testing, Washington will restrict itself to research and consultations with its allies prior to changing its position -- because it would give Reagan the freedom to use the treaty as an instrument in Geneva.

It also remains unclear on what Kohl is basing his hopes that after the Geneva summit a "considerable amount of traveling" will develop from the East to the West, which will include a visit by Erich Honecker to the FRG. The way in which the Eastern bloc is mobilizing against U.S. space project (SDI) does not justify such speculation. The SED general secretary will not undertake anything as long as Bonn's position remains unresolved. Kohl has obviously been tempted to draw two false conclusions: that he initiated the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting, and that the outcome will be to his advantage.

/12858  
CSO: 5200/2535

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BRIEFS

USSR 'PEACE' OFFICIAL'S AUSTRALIA REMARKS--A peace delegation from the Soviet Union now visiting Australia says only mutual deterrence can lead to world peace. Speaking in Melbourne, the head of the Soviet Peace Committee, Mr (Oleg Kharkhardin), said the United States would have to make significant concessions at the Geneva arms reduction talks. He said without such concessions the talks would not succeed. Mr (Kharkhardin) said there was hope some limitations on nuclear arms could be achieved. [word indistinct] he added there was doubt whether the United States would make any major concessions. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 29 Oct 85 BK]

/12858  
CSO: 5200/4307

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### SOVIET COMMENT ON NETHERLANDS PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON CRUISE MISSILES

#### 'Limit Netherlands Sovereignty'

PM241613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Drobkov report: "Preparing the Missile 'Pill'"]

[Text] Brussels, 23 Oct -- The debate has begun in the States General (parliament) of the Netherlands on the problem of the siting of U.S. cruise missiles in that country. Opposition parties' deputies are criticizing the government for trying to justify the delivery of "cruise death" to the Woensdrecht military base. There is particularly sharp criticism of the attempts to push the relevant decision through parliament by a simple majority.

The deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles will substantially limit the Netherlands' sovereignty, since it will give Washington the potential to drag that country into a destructive conflict at its own discretion. The opposition parties and the broad movement of antiwar forces demand that the government and parliament not allow the missiles onto the Netherlands' soil. If the right-center cabinet of R. Lubbers decides nevertheless to consent to it, then the opposition demands that the relevant agreement with the United States be approved by two-thirds of parliamentary deputies. The ruling parties do not have that majority at present. As the press reports, even some deputies from the ruling parties are prepared to vote against the siting of missiles.

In order to sweeten the bitter missile pill, those who advocate deploying the missiles try to prove that the Netherlands will supposedly receive some kind of guarantee, that in the event of a conflict, the U.S. missiles could only be launched after "consultations" with the local government. But even R. Lubbers was forced to admit recently that giving the Netherlands that right is unacceptable to NATO, since it would put The Hague in a special position in relation to the other allies.

The concessions to Washington and its most bellicose NATO partners which are being made by the present Netherlands Government are also leading to a marked fall in the popularity of the coalition cabinet. According to a public opinion poll held at the end of September, the Christian Democrats and Liberals belonging to it risk losing a considerable number of votes at the next elections and being robbed of a parliamentary majority.

Representatives of the country's antiwar forces now state that the government's policy prompts them to come out still more resolutely against the nuclear threat.

The debates which have begun in The Hague are evidence of the unprecedentedly broad opposition of the Netherlands public to the missile plans.

TASS Comment

LD021357 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] The Hague, October 2 TASS--The Government of the Netherlands has undertaken a step which is regarded as the preparation for deploying American cruise missiles. It sent to parliament a letter, saying that accord with the USA, if there is consent to deployment, will be finalised not in the form of an official agreement, but it will come as a mere exchange of notes. The attempt was thereby made to bypass the demand of the need of approving the agreement, affecting the country's sovereignty, by the parliamentary majority of two-thirds of the votes. Those who are in favour of deployment of missiles, have no such a majority. The government's impending capitulation to the U.S. demand has given rise to protests of progressive parties and mass organisations.

Petition Signed by Dutch Citizens

LD112110 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Text] The Hague, October 11 TASS--Two and a half million Dutch people have signed a petition urging the government and the parliament to cancel the plans of deploying American cruise missiles on the country's territory, Sinni Strikverda, chairperson of the national coordinating committee No To Cruise Missiles, has told a press conference.

The signature-collecting campaign, now at its peak, will end on October 26. Ms Strikverda pointed out that the new Soviet initiatives on deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals, advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev during his visit to France, facilitated the success of the campaign.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1082

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS COMMENTARY ON 'FAKED' U.S. REPORT ON SOVIET CW POTENTIAL

LD292311 Moscow TASS in English 2155 GMT 29 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 29 TASS — In an attempt at distracting public attention from its own preparations in the field of chemical weapons, the United States is whipping up a propaganda hysteria around some "Soviet chemical potential". A faked report on that subject has been issued by the Pentagon. The report on "The Threat of Soviet Chemical Weapons" is a collection of inventions about a "build-up of the Soviet chemical arsenal" and "the use of chemical weapons in the countries of Asia" designed to convince people that the Soviet Union "continues to pose a threat as regards the possible use of chemical weapons against the USA." In so doing, it passes over in silence evidence by American scientists and experts, who repeatedly refuted the lies about the Soviet Union's preparations for chemical warfare.

The fresh anti-Soviet invention is clearly timed to the debate opening in Congress on the appropriation in 1986 fiscal year of funds for the Pentagon for the production of binary munitions. This weapon is to be deployed chiefly outside the USA, above all, in Western Europe.

The USA has declined all the Soviet proposals on a ban on chemical weapons. In 1976 and 1980, bilateral Soviet-American talks on that issue were held on the USSR's initiative yet they were unilaterally broken up by Washington. Instead of a constructive search for ways to prohibit and destroy chemical weapons they in Washington prefer to put forward proposals that have nothing to do with the wish to outlaw chemical weapons.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1085



CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. CW PLANS THREATEN EUROPEAN THEATER

LD300035 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 29 Oct 85

[Nikolay Borin commentary]

[Excerpts] Several years ago a Pentagon computer arrived at an amazing conclusion: It said there could be no world war in 1914. The Pentagon's report on chemical weapons is just as absurd, although, of course, it is a more sinister document. It's been long since NATO adopted a doctrine of warfare in Europe that was born in the United States under the name of Air-Land Battle.

The doctrine was fed into the NATO military machine and is being carried out in all of its aspects under strong pressure from Washington. It provides for a combined use in the European theater of both nuclear and offensive chemical and bacteriological weapons.

To promote the doctrine, the United States has been developing a new generation of chemical weapons: binary weapons. The present stocks of chemical weapons in the United States alone totals 150,000 tons. Despite this, in its report the Pentagon tries to represent itself as defenseless in the face of what it describes as a Soviet chemical threat. This is truly unique information, or to be more precise, misinformation. What is more, the Pentagon claims that Western Europe is just as defenseless although it is well known that the United States has long since drawn that region into active preparations for chemical warfare. Britain, for one, has large stocks of chemical weapons belonging to NATO. Offensive operations involving chemical weapons are being practiced in Porton Down and new toxic agents are being tested on troops.

The British Government has never denied that Britain (has) chemical weapons. There have been reports that the Americans are secretly bringing chemical warheads to their cruise missile bases in Britain. As a British authority in the field, Stephen Rose, has observed, if the NATO governments had been really alarmed by some threat of Soviet toxic chemicals in Europe, they would have launched a program of civil defense (for) their population. As for chemical [word indistinct] of toxic agents, it has nothing to do with defense, the British expert says. Those who want to repel an attack do not need toxic chemicals.

The U.S. Administration still rejects a Soviet proposal for the conclusion of a treaty that would ban all chemical weapons.

Instead, it has adopted a [words indistinct] that provides for the delivery of a deep strike at Soviet defenses with chemical weapons. The pressure the Pentagon is exerting on the congress on the issue of producing chemical weapons for a European theater of war is pushing Europe to a dangerous brink of chemical warfare.

/8309  
CSO: 5200/1085

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS REPORT ON U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE CHEMICAL ARMS FUNDING VOTE

LD252304 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0535 GMT 25 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 25 Oct (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports: The Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Congress' House of Representatives has voted for the withdrawal of funds requested by the White House and the Pentagon for the production of chemical weapons from the draft military budget for fiscal year 1986. Members of the committee voted 26 to 24.

However, the congressmen left a loophole in their decision, which they adopted at a closed session, allowing for beginning production in 1987 of a qualitatively new type of chemical weapons, the so-called binary ammunition. True, the condition was made that before beginning production of these toxic agents, the administration must get agreement from its allies on the storing of such weapons on the territory of NATO member-countries.

It is already known that binary charges, for example the "big-eye" bomb, are in fact designed primarily for siting abroad, in Western Europe.

In this connection one can recall that as B. Rogers, commander of NATO Joint Armed Forces, openly stated, binary weapons can be launched together with nuclear weapons at the very beginning of armed actions on the European Continent.

As is known, 1 in 10 shells, mines, and air bombs in the U.S. chemical arsenal is in Europe, primarily stored in the FRG. Overall the Pentagon now has 55,000 metric tons of highly toxic, poisonous materials which paralyze the nervous system. More than 3 million units of ammunition containing these poisons are ready for combat use.

The decision adopted by the House Appropriations Committee will now be sent for consideration by the full House, and then to a joint conference committee. The possibility is not being dismissed that the congressional right wing, during further debate, will be able to alter the even such a half-hearted decision by the Appropriations Committee.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1085

GENERAL

## MOSCOW ASSAILS U.S. PLANS FOR NEUTRON WEAPONS

### Military Newspaper Report

PM170920 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu Borin article under the rubric "The Facts Expose":  
"Tightening the Neutron 'Noose'"]

[Text] According to reports in the Western press, the United States intends to step up pressure on its West European NATO allies with a view to getting them to agree to the siting of neutron weapons in Europe. As "legitimate grounds" for taking this action, it is proposed to use the agreement reached in 1983 at the conference of NATO Defense Ministers in Montebello (Canada), which envisages the "qualitative renewal of battlefield tactical weapons in the bloc countries' allied armed forces."

Around 400 neutron charges for 203 mm howitzers and 380 neutron charges for Lance missiles have already been manufactured and stockpiled on U.S. territory. But Congress' allocation of funds for the production in 1986 of neutron munitions for 155 mm howitzers and Lance missiles will depend on the U.S. allies' agreement to site them on their territories. The Pentagon admits that the United States now has over 7,000 nuclear munitions--including 2,500 for nuclear-capable planes, over 3,000 for nuclear artillery, and many hundreds for Pershing, Lance, and Honest John missiles--in the West European countries.

European "arms upgrading" with neutron weapons is seen by Washington not only as an additional buildup of its nuclear potential on the continent. It is also a type of military-political action aspiring to "limit" nuclear war to the Eastern hemisphere.

The United States strenuously publicizes neutron charges exclusively as a "defensive" means against the allegedly superior tank power of the Warsaw Pact armed forces. The West, U.S. and NATO official circles claim, simply has no "other effective means" for this.

However, it is well known that the NATO Bloc has recently been expediting the implementation of a program for the qualitative improvement and the quantitative accumulation of various nonnuclear means of combating tanks.

NATO envisages bringing the total number of its antitank means up to more than 190,000 units. The question arises: Why are neutron weapons needed on top of that? Are they really intended for antitank defense or are they allotted not a defensive but a quite different role in the military plans of the United States and NATO?

"Neutron weapons," in the opinion of former FRG Chancellor H Schmidt, "cannot be seen as purely defensive. Like most types of weapons in the world, they can, of course, quite easily be used for attack," and E Bahr, deputy in the West German Bundestag and chairman of the Commission on Arms Issues in this FRG legislative organ, noted directly in an interview with the weekly DIE ZEIT: "An aggressor who wants to clear, if I can use that term, of its defenders a territory that he wants to win and, if possible, to take industrial enterprises intact must be interested in neutron weapons. In other words, neutron weapons are of very great interest precisely as offensive weapons."

The attempts by U.S. official circles to "paint" neutron weapons as ordinary nonnuclear weapons and to ascribe to them some kind of "humane" qualities pursue one goal: To erase the fundamental distinction between them, lower the nuclear threshold, and deceive the peoples about their true role as mass destruction weapons. Even a layman in the military field can clearly understand the falsity of the claims about the "humaneness" of neutron weapons, which allegedly "guarantee the preservation of the civilian population's life and health." Suffice it to say that according to various scientific assessments, neutrons are five to ten times more dangerous than gamma rays. If one takes into account the high biological effectiveness of neutron radiation, then even if a munition of just one kiloton were detonated a deadly radiation zone something like eight square km in area would instantly be formed. And in West Europe, because of the high population density, population centers are only 1-2 km away from each other as a rule. The very thought of using neutron weapons there is blasphemous.

It was solemnly announced from the rostrum at the 26th CPSU Congress that the Soviet Union will not commence production of this most barbaric means of ensuring people's mass destruction unless neutron weapons appear in other states. The USSR is prepared to conclude an agreement banning these weapons once and for all. However, as is well known, on 6 August 1981--the 36th anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima--the White House announced its decision to embark on the large-scale production of neutron weapons. And today Washington is trying to place the neutron "noose" around the peoples of West Europe.

#### TASS Comment

LD172312 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1013 GMT 17 Oct 85

[Commentary by TASS observer Oleg Shirokov]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS)--Despite the many (? peaceful statements) by

representatives of the Washington administration, the United States is speeding up production of new deadly types of weapons, particularly neutron warheads. Thus, according to Western press reports, 400 neutron warheads for 203mm-caliber howitzers and 380 neutron warheads for "Lance" missiles have already been manufactured and stored in the United States. The U.S. military-industrial complex intends to increase the output of these deadly weapons. However, the U.S. Congress' allocation of supplementary funds for the production in 1986 of neutron ammunition for 155mm [figure as received] howitzers and "Lance" missiles will depend on whether the allies of the United States will agree to them being sited on their territory.

This explains the ever-growing pressure Washington is putting on its partners in the North Atlantic bloc. The agreement reached at Montebello, Canada, at a 1983 conference of NATO defense ministers providing for "the qualitative renewal of tactical battlefield support weapons in the joint armed forces of the bloc" is being used as the "legal" pretext for this pressure on the allies.

Washington's plans siting neutron weapons on European territory are meeting resolute resistance from the broad public of our continent. Therefore the United States is feverishly trying to advertize its neutron warheads as being purely "defensive" weapons, dressing them up as conventional non-nuclear weapons and trying to impart on them sort of "humane" properties. However, even a military affairs layman can clearly see the falsity of asserting that neutron weapons are "humane." Suffice it to say that according to various scientific estimates, neutrons are five to ten times as dangerous as gamma rays. The very thought of using neutron weapons on European territory is monstrous.

It is obvious that the actions of the American administration in advertizing neutron weapons as "humane" have only one aim: To deceive the peoples of the European continent about the true purpose of neutron warheads as weapons of mass annihilation, to force its allies in the North Atlantic bloc to agree to the siting of this new form of deadly weapon on their territory, and to convert the continent of Europe into an arsenal of neutron warheads for the United States and NATO. The peoples of the European continent must not permit this.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1095



GENERAL

USSR: SOCIALIST OCTOBER 1985 DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE IN VIENNA

TASS Report

LD162147 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 16 Oct 85

[Text] Vienna 16 October TASS--TASS correspondents Igor Revyakin and Anatoliy Tyupayev report:

The meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International ended here today. The meeting was presided over by chairman of the Socialist International Willy Brandt. During two days its participants, representatives of almost 50 social democratic and socialist parties of different countries, discussed questions linked with the 40th anniversary of the United Nations Organization, the situation in the Middle East, Latin America and South Africa. Problems of disarmament and detente, East-West relations held an important place at the meeting.

The meeting passed a number of documents including the so-called "Vienna Appeal." The continuing stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction threatens the existence of life on our planet, it is said in the appeal. Therefore, the arms race should be stopped in the interests of mankind.

The Socialist International feels special concern at the danger of spreading the arms race to outer space and rejects both the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative and any other such concepts. Disarmament, peaceful cooperation, and detente are the only reasonable answers to the danger which now hangs over mankind.

The Socialist International calls upon the United States and the Soviet Union to display initiative in reducing armaments and in this connection to continue also after 1985 the obligations which were undertaken in accordance with the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties, to reaffirm and intensify implementation of the 1972 ABM treaty, to agree on the beginning of the process of radical reduction of strategic armaments, to refrain from tests and deployment of anti-missile and anti-satellite weapons, from the arms race in outer space, to reach agreement on moratorium on any nuclear tests, as of January 1986, and the relevant treaty on a ban on such tests, and also an accord on stopping deployment of medium-range nuclear missile systems and their subsequent liquidation.

In the appeal it is noted that the constructive Soviet proposal which was put forward in Paris, on reduction of nuclear arms should be thoroughly studied.

Other statements adopted by the participants in the meeting of the Socialist International's bureau express support for the initiative in establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific area, the proposal establishing in Europe a zone free from chemical weapons and also an international peace march planned to be held in Central America from Panama to Mexico from December 1985 to January 1986. Resolutions on the situation in Central America and Chile note the Socialist International's approval of the Chilean patriots' actions in their struggle for restoration of democracy in the country. Stress the need of respecting the right of the people of Nicaragua to self-determination and emphasise that the United States should stop rendering support of and assistance to the "forces which are destabilizing the situation in the region."

#### PRAVDA Comment

PM231425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 85 First Edition p 6

[Special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev, Yu. Zhukov report: "Forum in the Redoutensaal"]

[Text] Vienna, October--So once again we found ourselves in the celebrated Redoutensaal of Vienna's Hofburg Palace. The entrance was bedecked with the flags of the states taking part in the talks which have been underway here for many years on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. But for two days, indicator boards appeared here: "Vienna. Socialist International-85. Conference on Disarmament."

Before turning to the conference, let us recall a memorable event which took place in this very hall. Some six years ago we were here at the ceremonial signing of a very important document which, as people of good will then hoped, would open the way to the consolidation of detente and disarmament. It was the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, commonly called SALT II. It was to be followed by talks preparing a SALT III; that is, a further reduction of nuclear arms, both strategic and medium-range.

These hopes were not fulfilled. People across the ocean not only refused to ratify the SALT II treaty, but wrecked all disarmament talks at the beginning of the eighties. The present U.S. Administration has sharply stepped up the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, setting a course of wrecking strategic parity and pursuing military superiority, and the "Star Wars" program--the American space militarization plan--has recently been added to this.

The world situation is explosive. It is profoundly worrying to the peoples. Reasonable political forces and public circles are seeking a way out of the impasse, considering possible means of influencing the course of events, and demanding a turn for the better in international development. The

Socialist International conference on disarmament held in Vienna also reflected these contemporary demands to some degree.

The forum in the Redoutensaal was the second event in this sphere for the parties and organizations belonging to the Socialist International. Seven years ago disarmament topics brought together representatives of socialist and social democrats from 20 countries to Helsinki for a similar conference. The relevant parties from 43 countries on five continents were represented in Vienna.

The world situation has changed, it has become much more dangerous; but people's desire for deliverance from this danger has also grown. W. Brandt, chairman of the Socialist International and leader of the West German Social Democrats, noted in a talk with us. That is why the number of participants and the range of topics covered have increased considerably.

Speaking at the opening of the conference, W. Brandt expressed his understanding of the current problems thus: "The world needs not better weapons, but better policies. We only have one world, and it must be protected against annihilation."

This statement to some extent set the tone for the discussion, in which dozens of speakers took part. During the assessment of the situation which has taken shape in the world today, the opinion was expressed that the world is on the brink of danger, that the arms race must be stopped at all costs, and that security cannot be ensured by military means; it is necessary to return to detente and develop businesslike international cooperation.

Recalling the dictum "If you want peace, prepare for war," which used to "embellish" the facade of the war ministry in Vienna at the beginning of the century, F. Sinowatz, chairman of the Austrian Socialist Party, observed that history itself has refuted it. It is now clear that peace can and must be strengthened through peaceful cooperation.

We in Africa are also concerned about the arms race, a representative of Senegal's socialists noted. Nuclear war does not respect borders; if it breaks out, Africa too, will be scorched. Delegates from Asian and Latin American countries, Australia, the United States, Canada, and West European states spoke of the terrible, universal nature of the danger of nuclear catastrophe.

The question logically arose: What is to be done, how can the world be protected against the danger? A basis for such reflections was provided by a Socialist International Consultative Council on Disarmament report presented by its chairman K. Sorsa, leader of the Social Democrats and prime minister of Finland.

Many of those who took part in the discussion noted that the struggle to end the arms race is not easy. Pessimistic notes were also struck occasionally. All the same, what prevailed was a realistic view of the possibility of ensuring peace, largely engendered by the fact that the Soviet Union has put forward a far-reaching program for improving the international situation.

The proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev and the important unilateral actions already taken by the Soviet Union were of great interest to the conference participants. Practically every speaker dealt with the USSR's bold new ideas and constructive actions.

The great significance of the Soviet proposals was noted in the speeches by O. Palme, leader of the Social Democrats and prime minister of Sweden; N. Kinnock, leader of the British Labor Party; and the representatives of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the socialists of Japan, Spain, France, El Salvador, and other countries. "The USSR's proposals," P. Nearchou, an observer from Greece's Panhellenic Socialist Movement, stated, "must be carefully weighed and examined."

The attention of the conference participants was attracted above all by the Soviet proposal to the United States that both sides should completely ban space strike arms and really radically reduce--by 50 percent--their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. Many speakers called on the United States to give a businesslike response to these proposals and accept them as a basis for discussion at the Geneva talks and at the Soviet-American summit meeting also due to be held in Geneva. But these appeals apparently fell on deaf ears.

Not only organizations belonging to the Socialist International, but also guests and observers were invited to the conference. Alongside the Soviet delegation, there were representatives from the PRC, Yugoslavia, Argentina, the United Nations, and the Nonaligned Movement. A U.S. Government representative was invited to set forth American views. But K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who came from Washington, managed to be late not only for the conference opening, but also for his speech, the time for which was fixed beforehand. And, after delivering his speech, he left immediately.

It is not only a question of the disrespect shown by an official Washington spokesman to an international forum. What is more important is the content of his speech. It was the standard collection of anti-Soviet and anti-communist sallies. Not a single constructive idea can be found in Adelman's speech.

While forced to admit that the Soviet proposals contain "a number of positive elements," he declared that Washington "cannot and will not accept them," and called for the continuing buildup of American nuclear arms and for the "Star Wars" program.

This stance did not meet with understanding. The many questions from the conference participants--will the United States agree to renounce the militarization of space given a radical reduction in strategic arms; what is stopping it from agreeing to ban nuclear tests; is it intending to present proposals in Geneva for a ban on antisatellite weapons?--got no answers.

The question of the nonmilitarization of space held a central place at the conference. None of the speakers supported the White House's notorious



"Strategic Defense Initiative" plans. On the contrary, the conference participants pointed to their extremely dangerous nature. In order to ensure peace, H. Buchbinder, a representative of the Swiss Social Democrats, observed, what is needed is not military-technical means, but political solutions. And one of these, as was stressed in the Redoutensaal, must be to prevent the militarization of space.

The discussion focused on key questions of concern to mankind. Many people noted the need to reassess the situation, to formulate new criteria and imperatives in international politics, to lift the threat of the annihilation of life on earth, and to return to detente and cooperation in order to resolve global problems.

In connection with the problem of nuclear disarmament, the conference participants spoke of the importance of the SALT I and SALT II treaties and insisted on the need for strict observance of the ABM treaty and the desirability of confirming its provisions, which ban the testing and deployment of strike arms in space. Among the urgent tasks, banning chemical weapons was frequently mentioned. In this connection a special resolution was adopted on the creation of a zone free from those weapons in Europe.

Speakers from Asian, African, and Latin American countries noted the need to put an end to regional conflicts, ensure the peoples' sovereignty, abolish apartheid, and stop American interference in Nicaragua's affairs and noted the interconnection between disarmament and development.

Of course, the opinions of the conference participants did not coincide on all points. There was evidence of the differing positions of the socialist parties, some of which head or belong to governments, while others are opposition parties. There was also evidence of the burden of old anti-Soviet anticommunist ideas. This was reflected, in particular, in the assessments of the causes of the arms race and in claims about the "equal responsibility of the two superpowers," although it has long been proven that this race is the offspring of the policy of U.S. imperialism.

But in general, the conference participants found that their positions and approaches coincided. This applied primarily to the tasks and demands of the struggle to eliminate the threat of war, end the arms race, and strengthen the foundations of peace and cooperation. This is shown in the "Vienna Appeal" of the Socialist International, approved by the conference, which notes that the continuing stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction threatens the existence of life on the planet; and therefore, in mankind's interests, the arms race must be halted. The Document points out that the Socialist International is particularly concerned about the danger of the spread of the arms race to outer space and rejects both the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" and any other such concepts. Disarmament, peaceful cooperation, and any other such concepts. Disarmament, peaceful cooperation, and detente are the only reasonable answers to the danger threatening mankind.

The Socialist International calls on the United States and the USSR to display initiative in order to reduce arms, to continue even after 1985 to



fulfill the commitments adopted under the SALT I and SALT II treaties, to confirm and strengthen the fulfillments of the ABM Treaty, to reach agreement on starting a process of radical strategic arms reduction, to refrain from testing and deploying anti arms race in outer space, and to reach an agreement on a moratorium on all nuclear tests from January 1986 and a corresponding treaty banning such tests, as well as an agreement on ending the further deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons systems and their subsequent elimination. The appeal notes that "the constructive Soviet proposal put forward in Paris on nuclear arms reduction must be studied carefully."

The Socialist International, the document says in conclusion, appeals first to the United States and the USSR, but also to all governments, parties, religious and public movements, and people of all countries and continents to do everything possible to renounce arms and follow the path of peace, freedom, and human dignity.

In this connection much was said at the conference about the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. Literally everyone noted its great significance, expressed the desire for success, and recalled the hopes which the people pin on the meeting for a turn for the better in international affairs and an end to the arms race on earth and its prevention in space.

"I responded positively to the proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev," O Palme told us. These are constructive proposals. They provide a basis for talks--there is something to discuss and to agree on. Of course, Geneva will not decide everything. This can only be the beginning. But it must be said that people expect a favorable outcome from the meeting. The world public demands the normalization of the international situation.

Judging from the many speeches at the conference, the political and public forces associated with Socialist International parties intend to step up their activity in favor of disarmament and cooperation with all states and movements advocating detente, disarmament, and peace.

The Vienna conference showed that differences of ideological views are not a hindrance to dialogue and mutual understanding in the struggle to consolidate peace, and the alarming situation urgently requires effective efforts from the workers and democratic movement in the struggle against the threat of war. No one has the right to avoid responsibility for the cause of peace today.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1099

GENERAL

MOSCOW NOTES UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEBATES ON DISARMAMENT

TASS Cites Mexican, Soviet Representatives

LD151812 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Text] New York 14 October TASS--The task of preventing an arms race in space and its termination on earth is in the focus of attention of the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly (political and security questions, including disarmament), which today opened a general debate on all the items of the agenda related to disarmament. Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico who opened the debate, said that the overwhelming majority of the world population demanded two concrete actions, the prevention of an arms race in space and the conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. Space is the common asset of mankind and must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, the Mexican delegate said. He pointed out the special importance of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and urged the USAS to follow the Soviet Union's example.

The Soviet Union's latest proposals in combination with its earlier actions constitute a programme of constructive and (?realistic) measures, the implementation of which would lead to an improvement of the explosive situation which jeopardizes peace, Oleg Troyanovskiy, the Soviet Union's permanent representative to the United Nations, said. The point of the Soviet proposal is to take a decision once and forever that would be worthy of the space age of earthlings: "Star Peace" instead of "Star Wars." A major step would be taken in this way towards detente and the implementation of the lofty goals of the U.N. charter to promote international cooperation and to rid the present and succeeding generations of the scourge of war.

Austria, Colombia, Indonesia, Kuwait Cited

LD181219 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 18 Oct 85

[Text] New York 18 October TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports: No militarization of outer space and a full end to all nuclear weapons testing has been demanded by delegates from neutral and non-aligned countries speaking in the U.N. General Assembly's first committee which is continuing a general debate on all aspects of disarmament.

The speakers (?point out) the cardinal difference in the Soviet and U.S. approaches to this overriding problem of the times.

Austria's ambassador to the United Nations, Karl Fischer, said the need to sign a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, which could form the basis of disarmament efforts, was becoming ever more apparent.

He noted that one great power had responded to that need by imposing a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts, and doing that on the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing, while the other had instead invited experts to attend its continued nuclear testing.

Fischer said the Austrian Government was particularly troubled by the threat of outer space becoming militarized. He said that threat (?serves to) underline the need to reach an agreement that would bar weapons from space once and for all.

He added that tests of anti-satellite weapons systems were a very worrying development as it would be incredibly difficult to ban and destroy [word indistinct] systems once they had been tested and deployed.

Carlos Alban-Holguin, permanent representative of Colombia to the United Nations, said preventing the militarization of outer space was the paramount task of mankind today. He said the [word indistinct] and uses of outer space should be in the interests of all countries and neither technological potential nor military or economic might could justify making space a scene of military rivalry.

N. Soutresna of Indonesia urged all nuclear powers to follow the noble example of the Soviet Union and agree to an immediate moratorium on nuclear explosions, demonstrating thereby their desire to reverse the nuclear arms race.

He said only the lack of political will could be the (?impediment) to that.

According to Mohammad A. Abdulhasan, Kuwaiti ambassador to the United Nations, forging along with the "Star Wars" program would mean a new dimension to the arms race and another hindrance to disarmament efforts.

The [word indistinct] humanity demanded keeping weapons from space, he said.

#### Outer Space Cooperation Proposed

LD112147 Moscow TASS In English 1606 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Text] New York 11 October TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshov reports:

The Soviet Union has tabled at the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly (political and security issues, including disarmament) a draft resolution on international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space

in the conditions of its non-militarization. The draft resolution points out the vital need to prevent, before it is too late, arms race in outer space that would lead to a sharp growth of the danger of nuclear war, undermine prospects for the limitation and reduction of arms as a whole and put up insurmountable obstacles to the development of international cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space.

The draft resolution proposes that an international conference be convened not later than in 1987 with the participation of states having a big outer space potential and other countries concerned to examine in full the question of international cooperation in peaceful exploration and uses of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarization and coordination of its main directions and principles of such cooperation.

The large-scale Soviet initiatives have set the fashion for the work of the fifth committee. Addressing its organizing session, Ali Alatas [TASS spelling], permanent representative of Indonesia to the U.N., who has been elected chairman of the first committee, pointed out that the committee had been entrusted a tremendous task in order to live up to the hopes of the international security issues. He urged the delegates to display the necessary political will and determination in order to make a real contribution to the attainment of the aims of the world free from the threat of war and wasteful arms race, a world of general security and prosperity.

#### Debate Ends

LD112307 Moscow TASS in English 2204 GMT 11 Oct 85

[Text] New York 12 October TASS--The General political debate at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly has ended on (?Friday) [11 October]. In the course of the debate more than 130 heads of delegations have spelled out the views of their governments on the most important problems of the present. The debate has mirrored mankind's urgent wish to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, prevent an arms race in outer space and put an end to it on earth, radically improve the international atmosphere in favour of cooperation of states, their collective efforts directed at eliminating regional seats of tensions, resolution of the objectives of socio-economic progress. The concept of "Star Peace" put forward by the Soviet Union counter to the sinister "Star Wars" plans occupied the main place in the debate.

As representatives of the socialist and many non-aligned states, a number of Western countries pointed out, this large-scale initiative accords with the aspirations of the entire mankind and opens truly unlimited possibilities for preserving peaceful outer space for general benefit. At the same time, most of the speakers in the debate have condemned the notorious U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative" as being extremely dangerous to the whole mankind.

The moratorium unilaterally introduced by the USSR on all nuclear blasts, the initiatives aimed at resolving the key problem of the present--preventing threat of war, which were put forward during the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to France, have met with broad support from the international community.

The heads of the delegations of most countries declared that the jubilee session of the United Nations Organisation, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary, should contribute to the effectiveness of that organisation which was set up as a result of the victory in the Second World War over Nazism and militarism with the main aim of delivering the generations to come from the calamities of war.

USSR's Space Guidelines-Official UN Document

LD142314 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 14 Oct 85

[Text] New York 14 October TASS--Soviet-proposed basic guidelines and principles for maintaining international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space while keeping it free from arms, have been issued here as an official document of the United Nations General Assembly.

Implementing plans to militarize outer space, it said, would dramatically increase the nuclear threat and rob the nations of the hope that the day would eventually come when all nuclear weapons would vanish from the face of the earth.

The people and governments of all countries should realize the scope of the task facing mankind and (?make) sure of their historic responsibility for accomplishing it.

The Soviet Union called on all countries and nations to do everything possible to keep the arms race out of space and pool efforts for the latter's peaceful exploration for the benefit of all humanity.

/12913

CSO: 5200/1103



GENERAL

SOVIET COMMENT ON DISARMAMENT MESSAGE FROM NON-ALIGNED LEADERS

Leaders' Message

PM301220 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

["Joint Message to M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan"]

[Text] The world is placing the greatest hopes in your meeting in Geneva next month. All peoples and governments hope you will succeed in stopping the process of growing tension in recent years and in opening up an era of peace and security for the whole of mankind.

You are aware, as we are, of the growth of stockpiles of nuclear weapons which, if used even due to chance or error, will cast us into an abyss of total destruction. No interests can justify this threat to present and future generations. Prevention of nuclear war is thus a key issue not only for our peoples and their destiny, but also for the peoples of all continents. Because the consequences of nuclear war threaten the citizens of all states equally, it is for us, too, exceptionally important that the appropriate conditions are created at your meeting and that concrete steps are taken toward disarmament and peace.

The tragedy of our time is that chiefly because of mutual distrust, it has thus far not proved possible to end the nuclear arms race. The task of strengthening mutual trust is acquiring paramount importance for your security, and for the security of all states and all peoples, as well as for the very existence of the planet on which we all live.

Your meeting is an historic opportunity to decisively break out of the vicious circles of arms race escalation. We hope that having demonstrated the will to establish mutual trust by means of overcoming disagreements, you will provide a fresh stimulus for your bilateral talks, and for the multilateral talks in Geneva, Stockholm, and Vienna.

We value positively the fact that this year your governments have begun talks in Geneva on space and nuclear armaments, which must be examined as interconnected issues. We are disturbed by the fact that these talks have not yet yielded any results. In our view, however, the different proposals that have been put forward lately -- and certain events, too, apparently -- give grounds for fresh hope that considerable reductions in nuclear weapons arsenals, together with effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space, will be examined seriously at the bilateral talks in Geneva, in accordance with the decisions we expect from your forthcoming meeting.

In the Delhi declaration, adopted in January of this year, we made a call for a complete cessation of the testing, production, and siting [razmeshcheniye] of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery, and of space armaments, to be followed immediately by considerable reductions in nuclear forces. This would ease the task of preventing an arms race in space and of ending the arms race on earth, and would lead ultimately to the elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

During the time that has passed since January, some of us have had the honor of discussing our proposals with you personally, and with the leaders of other states which possess nuclear weapons. In the Delhi appeal we especially singled out the idea of halting all nuclear weapons tests and of concluding as soon as possible a treaty banning tests completely. In light of the useful talks that have taken place, we have decided to put forward some of our thoughts for examination at your meeting in Geneva.

We propose that you halt all nuclear tests for a year. This period could be prolonged or tests could be stopped forever.

We expect other states possessing nuclear weapons to adopt analogous measures.

We believe such a measure would considerably improve the prospects to concluding serious agreements, and would be a factor restraining the creation [sozdaniye] of new, more rapid and accurate types of weapons, which is now continuing at an unslackening rate, despite the negotiations which are under way.

The problems of monitoring the halt to tests which we propose are difficult ones, but they are not insuperable. It seems to us that you yourselves could find a solution that would satisfy both of you. If you consider it helpful, we are ready to offer you our good services toward helping to create effective monitoring methods.

Monitoring with the help of a third side could assure a high degree of confidence that the testing programs have been halted. In order to attain this goal, we propose that monitoring mechanisms be set up on the territory of our countries.

A truly enormous responsibility has been given to you. We are convinced that the international community will render you support in your efforts. Regarding ourselves, we again declare our readiness to work together with you in the name of ensuring common security and the survival of mankind.

Rajiv Gandhi, prime minister of India  
Miguel de la Madrid, president of Mexico  
Olof Palme, prime minister of Sweden  
Raul Alfonsin, president of Argentina  
Julius Nyerere, president of Tanzania  
Andreas Papandreu, prime minister of Greece

### Sweden's Palme Briefs Press

LD302147 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Text] Stockholm, October 30 TASS -- Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, at a press conference held here today, briefed journalists in detail on the joint message of the heads of state and government of six countries to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The time that passed since the adoption of the Delhi Declaration by the authors of the message, he said, has shown that the governments of the majority of countries of the world support this document and its proposals aimed at curbing the nuclear arms race.

Prevention of nuclear war the consequences of which would be pernicious for the majority of the population of the earth, is not only the task of the powers having nuclear weapons but of other countries, too, which also bear responsibility in that issue.

Therefore, on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the authors of the declaration decided to approach the leaders of two great powers of the world with the proposal to suspend all nuclear tests for one year which would be a very important step. The introduction of such a moratorium, stressed the prime minister, would help suspend creation and development of new types of nuclear armaments, which is of great significance in the present-day conditions.

Answering the question what proposals mentioned in the text of the joint message give ground for new hopes at Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva, the head of the Swedish Government emphasised that among these proposals was above all the proposal to the U.S. Government, put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in the course of his visit to France, that the two countries should agree on a really radical, 50-percent reduction of their nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory. That Soviet step is noteworthy since the United States repeatedly mentioned in word the need of a substantial reduction of strategic nuclear armaments, said Olof Palme.

### U.S. Rejects Appeal

LD302001 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 30 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 30 TASS -- The call of the leaders of six non-aligned countries to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan to halt all nuclear tests for a year was immediately turned down by Washington. The proposal was contained in a joint message sent by the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece. They expressed the opinion that this step would considerably improve prospects for concluding important agreements and be a factor for containing the creation of new, swifter and more accurate weapons.

Judging by the statement of a spokesman for the Department of State, the USA holds an opposite stand. Commenting on the message, the spokesman said that the proposal is being studied. He added, however, that the USA needs underground nuclear tests to ensure the efficiency of means of deterrence and also to ensure reliability and safety of the U.S. arsenal.

At the latest briefing, a spokesman for the White House avoided answering the question whether President Reagan has taken a decision on reaction to the Soviet Union's latest initiatives in the sphere.

Meanwhile, it is well known that an end to nuclear weapon tests offers an opportunity to put a brake to the nuclear arms race. If the USSR and the USA succeeded in coming to terms on the matter, the qualitative refinement of nuclear arms would be stopped.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1087

GENERAL

NAKASONE MEETS REAGAN, SUPPORTS ARMS CONTROL INITIATIVES

OW250429 Tokyo KYODO in English 0419 GMT 25 Oct 85

[By Shiro Yoneyama]

[Excerpt] New York, Oct. 24 KYODO -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan Thursday told his counterparts from major Western allies -- Japan, Canada, Britain, Italy and West Germany -- that he will keep them fully briefed on his summit meeting with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. The meeting, the first U.S.-Soviet summit in six years, is scheduled for November 19-20 in Geneva.

Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone assured Reagan during a working dinner at a New York hotel that the Reagan administration can "count on Japan's complete support" for its peace and arms control initiatives in the U.S.-Soviet summit, a Japanese official said. The dinner, hosted by Reagan and his wife Nancy, took place after the U.S. President won what U.S. Secretary of State George P. Shultz called "uniform and deep" support from the allied leaders during a 105-minute afternoon session for his decision to meet Gorbachev.

During the dinner, the Japanese official said, Reagan, Nakasone, and Prime Ministers Brian Mulroney of Canada, Margaret Thatcher of Britain, Bettino Craxi of Italy and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl exchanged views on the Soviet Union and the new Soviet leader. The official said Nakasone commented that the Soviet Union is "at a turning point" due to difficulties at home and abroad. "Gorbachev has another 20 years in hand and he wants peace to carry out economic reform," the Japanese official quoted Nakasone as saying. The premier also told Reagan and other Western leaders he believes Gorbachev is a "Leninist-type strategist."

Nakasone also recommended to Reagan that France be briefed, like Japan and other U.S. allies, on the Geneva summit and arms control negotiations. Reagan nodded his assent, according to the Japanese official, who declined to be named. French President Francois Mitterrand did not attend the mini-summit of six industrial democracies "because of a tight schedule." He discussed nuclear disarmament issues extensively with Gorbachev during Gorbachev's trip to Paris earlier this month.

The Reagan administration plans to consult separately with Japan and other leaders who were at the mini-summit on the Geneva meeting and related developments, Japanese officials said. The officials added that Nakasone suggested to Reagan that he should take into account the Soviet Communist Party's convention in February in dealing with arms control talks with the Soviets. The Japanese leader also reiterated that the Americans should proceed with the arms control talks with the Kremlin "flexibly and patiently" to promote East-West detente, they said.

/12858  
CSO: 5260/13

END



**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

**21 NOV 85**